

JUN 7 1932

VOL. LIII, 2

WHOLE No. 210

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK, ROGER M. JONES,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

APRIL, MAY, JUNE
1932

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Die Quellen für das spätrömische Heerwesen. By ERNST VON NISCHER,	97
Parmenides and the <i>Parmenides</i> of Plato. By HAROLD FREDRIK CHERNISS,	122
The <i>Diritas</i> of Tiberius. By KENNETH SCOTT,	139
Some Political Allusions in Plautus' <i>Trinummus</i> . By TENNEY FRANK,	152
Plato in Afghanistan and India. By W. L. LORIMER,	157
Hipponiensis. By A. SOUTER,	162
On Catullus XXIX, 8. By EDWARD F. D'ARMS,	165
The Grammar of Drinking Healths. By GRACE H. MACURDY,	168
REPORTS:	172
Revue de Philologie, III, Troisième Série (1929) (CAROL WIGHT).—Glotta, XX, 1-2 (1931) (ROLAND G. KENT).	
REVIEWS:	179
<i>Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's</i> Der Glaube der Hellenen (IVAN M. LINFORTH).— <i>Fr. Heichelheim's</i> Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen (TENNEY FRANK).— <i>Deferrari</i> and <i>Campbell's</i> A Concordance of Prudentius; Sir J. G. Frazer's <i>Ovid's Fasti</i> ; <i>Enrico Carrara's</i> Francesco Petrarca; <i>Pierre de Labriolle's</i> Les Satires de Juvénal (WILFRED P. MUSTARD).—A. K. Griffin's <i>Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct</i> (HAROLD CHERNISS).—E. K. Rand's A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible (C. U. CLARK).— <i>Alphonsus Kurfess's</i> Sallusti Epistulae ad Caesarem Senem (L. A. POST).—A. von Gerkan's Lauf der römischen Stadtmauer (TENNEY FRANK).	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	190

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive, free of charge, twenty-five copies of their respective contributions. An equal number of additional copies, if desired, will be furnished at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LIII, 2

WHOLE No. 210

DIE QUELLEN FÜR DAS SPÄTRÖMISCHE HEERWESEN.

(Continued from A. J. P. LIII 40.)

Die Notitia Occidentis.

Wesentlich günstiger verhält es sich bei der *Notitia Occidentis*, indem hier, wie bereits erwähnt, bei einigen Kapiteln (V + VI und VII) dieselben Abteilungen des Feldheeres einmal nach ihrer Gattung, das andre Mal nach ihrer Einteilung erscheinen. Durch diese Wiederholung wird eine gewisse Kontrolle ermöglicht, die freilich dadurch erschwert ist, daß die wenigsten Abteilungen in den verschiedenen Kapiteln mit genau denselben Namen genannt werden. Im Gegenteil, die Abweichungen sind mitunter so bedeutend, daß es schwer fällt, die in dem einen Kapitel ausgewiesenen Abteilungen ohneweiters in dem anderen zu finden. Ein weiterer Uebelstand ist ferner, daß die Namen oft nur abgekürzt oder in landläufiger Form, oder mit Weglassung der unterscheidenden Beifügung *seniores* und *iuniores* wiedergegeben sind, so daß ein Schluß auf die entsprechende Abteilung im anderen Kapitel nicht eindeutig gezogen werden kann. Hiezu kommen noch die verschiedenartigsten, bei einem derartig komplizierten und für den Abschreiber nicht leichten Text erklärlichen Fehler, so die Verstümmelung einzelner Namen oder deren gänzliche Auslassung. Da es jedoch schon ein ganz besonderes Verhängnis sein müßte, daß bei der verhältnismäßig geringen Zahl von Auslassungen ein Name zweimal übergangen wurde, so läßt sich der Text in diesem Abschnitt mit ziemlicher Wahrscheinlichkeit vollkommen lückenlos wie-

derherstellen. Hiebei darf man allerdings nicht vergessen, daß zwischen Kapitel VII und den Kapiteln V und VI einige Jahre liegen, während welcher einige Abteilungen eingegangen, hingegen andere wieder aufgestellt worden sein können.

Im Kapitel V fehlen folgende Abteilungen des Kapitels VII:

In Italien:	104 Cursarienses iuniores
VII 17 victores seniores	105 Musmagenses
36 Placidi Valentinianici felices.	107 insidiatores
	108 truncensimani
In Illyrien:	109 Abulci
VII 62 Catarienses.	110 exploratores.
In Gallien:	In Britannien:
VII 97 balistarii	VII 154 victores iuniores Britannici
98 defensores iuniores	155 primani iuniores
99 Garronenses	156 secundani iuniores.
100 Anderetiani	
101 Acincenses	

Im Kapitel VI fehlen folgende Abteilungen des Kapitels VII:

In Britannien:	203 equites stablesiani
VII 200 equites catafractarii iuniores	204 equites Syri.
201 equites scutarii Aureliaci	In Tingitanien:
202/05 equites Honoriani	207 equites scutarii seniores.
Taifali seniores	

Im Kapitel VII fehlen folgende Abteilungen der Kapitel V und VI:

Auxilia Palatina:	262 Antianenses.
V 183 Augustei	Vexillationes Comitatus:
217 felices iuniores Galliani.	VI 75 comites iuniores
	77 equites sagittarii iuniores.
Legiones Pseudocomitatenses:	85 cuneus equitum promotorum.
V 261 Taurunenses	

Da die Kapitel V und VI die Truppengattung, das Kapitel VII die Einteilung in die einzelnen Feldheere enthalten, so bedeutet das Fehlen einer Abteilung in einem derselben einen bedeutenden Verlust, weil sich die nähere Bestimmung nicht durchwegs mit völliger Sicherheit ergänzen läßt. Die Reihenfolge im Kapitel V ist wohl im Allgemeinen derart, daß zuerst,

wie im Kapitel VII, alle *Legiones Palatinae* von Italien, dann von Illyrien, Gallien u. s. w., hierauf die *Auxilia Palatina* in derselben Aufeinanderfolge, desgleichen die *Legiones Comitatus* und zuletzt die *Legiones Pseudocomitatenses* aufgezählt werden. Analog verhält es sich mit den *Vexillationes Palatinae* und den *Vexillationes Comitatus* im Kapitel VI. Es lassen sich jedoch auch zahlreiche Beispiele dafür anführen, daß diese rangmäßige Aufeinanderfolge unterbrochen wurde. Jedenfalls können wir daraus nur in vereinzelten Fällen sichere Schlüsse ziehen für die nähere Bestimmung der Truppengattung oder der Einteilung, und müssen dieses Hilfsmittel stets mit der größten Vorsicht und Zurückhaltung gebrauchen.

Wir haben als fehlend nachfolgende Abteilungen festgestellt:

a) VII 17 *victores seniores*.—Sämtliche in der *Notitia dignitatum* aufgezählte *victores* sind *Auxilia Palatina*, darunter auch die *victores iuniores* (Occ. V 37 = 185 = VII 126). Es besteht daher gar kein Anlaß, hier eine Ausnahme zu machen, und zwar um so weniger, als die gleichnamigen, bloß durch die Beifügung *seniores* und *iuniores* unterschiedenen Abteilungen stets ein zusammengehöriges Paar derselben Waffen- und Truppengattung bilden.

b) VII 36 *Placidi Valentinianici felices*.—Seeck (*Notitia S.* 325) zählt diese Abteilung zu den *Pseudocomitatenses*. Ich halte sie für ein *Auxilium Palatinum*, da von den 12 Truppenkörpern der *Notitia dignitatum*, die die Bezeichnung *felices* tragen, 9 *Auxilia Palatina*, dagegen nur 2 *Legiones Comitatus* und 1 *Legio Pseudocomitatenses* sind. Auch steht, was freilich nicht allzuviel besagen will, die Einteilung der *Placidi Valentinianici* als *Auxilium Palatinum* mit der Reihenfolge im Kapitel VII in keinem Widerspruch, da auf dieselben 2 *Auxilia Palatina*, *Gratianenses iuniores* und *Marcomanni*, folgen.

c) VII 61 *Valentinianenses*. 71 *Valentinianenses*.

Diesen beiden Abteilungen stehen im Kapitel V nur die *Valentinianenses iuniores* (42 = 190) gegenüber, ein *Auxilium Palatinum*. Somit ist im Kapitel V eine Abteilung (*Aux. Pal.*) *Valentinianenses seniores* ausgefallen, und VII 61 und VII 71 beziehen sich auf diese beiden *Auxilia Palatina*, so daß die einen *Valentinianenses* (61 oder 71) die *seniores*, die anderen die *iuniores* sind.

d) VII 97 *balistarii*.—Mit Ausnahme der *milites balistarii* (Occ. XLI 23), die jedoch an dieser Stelle nicht in Betracht kommen, sind alle *balistarii* Legionen. Unter den 6 Abteilungen sind 3 *Legiones Comitatus* und 2 *Pseudocomitatus*, welche letztere jedoch erst von Theodosius I errichtet wurden. Nun erzählt Ammian (XVI 2), daß Julian im Jahre 356 mit den *cataphractarii* und *balistarii* von Augustodunum nach Remi marschierte. Da alle übrigen *balistarii* im Ostreiche standen, so kommen für diese Stelle nur unsere, die gallischen *balistarii* in Betracht, und da sie, wie aus der Schilderung Ammians hervorgeht, Feldtruppen waren, so können sie, wie ich an anderer Stelle ^{31a} ausgeführt habe, nur *Comitatus*, niemals aber *Pseudocomitatus* gewesen sein.

e) VII 98 *defensores iuniores*.—Da die *seniores* desselben Namens (Occ. V 117 = 267 = VII 93), die bei einer Ungleichheit im Range immer der höheren Gruppe angehörten, *Pseudocomitatus* sind, müssen es die *iuniores* gleichfalls sein.

f) VII 107 *insidiatores*. 110 *exploratores*. Alle derart nach ihrer besonderen Verwendung bezeichneten Abteilungen, die unmittelbar den Kommandanten der Feldheere unterstehen und deren Truppengattung einwandfrei überliefert ist, sind — mit Ausnahme eines *Auxilium Palatinum defensores* (Or. 16 = 57) — durchwegs *Pseudocomitatus*.³² Auch spricht schon der Umstand, daß diese Abteilungen fast durchwegs auf die alten *Numeri* des Fußvolkes zurückgehen, für ihre Einteilung als *Pseudocomitatus*.

g) VII 108 *truncensimani*. 154 *victores iuniores Britannici*. 155 *primani iuniores*. 156 *secundani iuniores*.—Die Reihenfolge im Kapitel VII gibt uns keinen Anhaltspunkt für die Gattung der *truncensimani*, *primani* und *secundani*. Ihr Name zeigt uns jedoch, daß es Legionen sein müssen, da sich eine derartige Namensbildung aus der Nummer des Truppenkörpers eben nur bei Legionen vorfindet. Die beiden britanischen Abteilungen können nur *Comitatus* sein, da der

^{31a} The Army Reforms of Diocletian and Constantine (Journal of Roman Studies XIII), S. 30 ff.

³² Es sind dies: *defensores seniores* (Occ. V 117 = 267 = VII 93); *funditores* (Or. VII 16 = 52); *superventores iuniores* (Occ. V 120 = 270 = VII 96).

Comes Britanniarum auf jeden Fall über ein kleines Feldheer verfügen mußte, ihm aber außer den beiden genannten Abteilungen und einigen Reiterregimentern nur noch die *victores iuniores Britannici* unterstanden. Diese sind ein Auxilium Palatinum und gehören, worauf wir noch später zurückkommen werden, in eine Gruppe mit den *victores seniores* (Occ. VII 17) und *iuniores* (Occ. V 37 = 185 = VII 126).

Die *truncensimani* oder, wie sie richtig heißen, *tricesimani* waren Pseudocomitatenses. Die aus Legionsvexillationen³³ gebildeten Neulegionen wurden allerdings zumeist den Feldheeren einverleibt. Wir kennen jedoch auch Ausnahmen, wo sie unter den Besatzungstruppen anzutreffen sind.³⁴ Die Erklärung für diesen Vorgang muß einer späteren Abhandlung vorbehalten bleiben.

h) In der Notitia dignitatum erscheinen mehrere Legionen mit dem Namen *septimani*, deren Zusammenhang noch nicht geklärt ist. Es sind dies:

Occ. V 228 septimani seniores (leg. com.)	VII 31 septimani iuniores (Italien)
242 septimani iuniores (leg. com.)	103 septimani iuniores (Gallien)
273 septimani (pseudocom.)	132 septimani seniores (Hispanien)
	139 septimani iuniores (Tingitanien).

Im Kapitel V fehlt mithin eine der im Kapitel VII genannten Abteilungen, während im letzteren wieder irrtümlich 3 Abteilungen *iuniores* nur eine Abteilung *seniores* gegenübersteht. Anscheinend waren die italischen *septimani* die *seniores*. Es folgen sich nämlich in den Kapiteln V und VII:

³³ Während die Vexillationes Palatinae und Comitatus der Notitia dignitatum Reiterregimenter zu je 500 Mann darstellen, sind die hier erwähnten Vexillationen kombinierte Abteilungen, wie sie auch schon in den früheren Jahrhunderten aus einem oder mehreren Truppenkörpern zu einem bestimmten Zwecke (Feldzug, größere Arbeiten) entnommen und unter einem Feldzeichen, dem Vexillum, nach dem sie auch benannt sind, vereinigt wurden, wenn man aus irgend einem Grunde nicht ganze Abteilungen aus einer Provinz abziehen wollte. Vgl. CIL III 600; 1980.

³⁴ Als Legiones Riparienses: V Macedonica und XIII gemina, Or. XXVIII 14; 15. Als Pseudocomitatenses: I Italica (Or. VII 53); IV Italica (Or. VII 54); septimani (Occ. V 123 = 273 = VII 103).

V 228 septimani seniores.
229 regii.

VII 31 septimani iuniores.
32 regii.

Die irrtümliche Schreibung *iuniores* im Kapitel VII mag dadurch entstanden sein, daß dort den *septimani* die *mattiarii iuniores* (VII 30) vorangehen. Da die *seniores* auf keinen Fall Pseudocomitatenses gewesen sein können, so kommen für letztere nur die gallische und die tingitanische Abteilung in Betracht. Die größere Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht dafür, daß wir die Pseudocomitatenses in Gallien zu suchen haben. Hier standen auch noch andere Abteilungen Pseudocomitatenses, während in Tingitanien keine genannt werden. Ueberdies betrug das kleine tingitanische Feldheer, auch wenn wir die *septimani* als Comitatuses rechnen, nur 3000 Mann Fußvolk und 1500 Reiter;³⁵ schwächer werden wir es wohl kaum annehmen dürfen.

Stellen wir nun die sich entsprechenden Stellen der Kapitel V und VII einander gegenüber, so zeigt sich uns folgendes Bild:

V 228 septimani seniores =	VII 31 Comitatuses in Italien und 132 Comitatuses in Hispanien.
242 septimani iuniores =	139 Comitatuses in Tingitanien.
273 septimani iuniores =	103 Pseudocomitatenses in Gallien.

i) VII 104 Cursarienses iuniores.—Sie sind die zu den gleichfalls im gallischen Feldheer eingeteilten Ursarienses (Occ. 244 = VII 85), bei denen *seniores* zu ergänzen ist, gehörigen *iuniores*. Wie die Ursarienses seniores sind sie eine Legio Comitatusis, da ein Uebergreifen der Bezeichnung *seniores-iuniores*, so daß z. B. die *seniores* Comitatuses, die *iuniores* Pseudocomitatenses sind, niemals stattfindet, wenn wir von den nach alten Grenzlegionen benannten Neuformationen absehen, für welche andere Grundsätze der Namensgebung gelten.

k) VII 62 Catarienses. 99 Garronenses. 100 Anderetiani. 101 Acincenses. 105 Musmagenses. 109 Abulci.—Die hier zusammengefaßten Abteilungen sind, wie schon aus der Namensbildung hervorgeht, durchwegs Legionen. Die Klassifizierung derselben als Comitatuses und Pseudocomitatenses ergibt sich zum Teil aus der Reihenfolge in der Notitia dignitatum, zum

³⁵ 2 Auxilia Palatina zu 500 Mann, 2 Legiones Comitatuses zu 1000 Mann, 3 Vexillationes Comitatuses zu 500 Reiter.

Teil können wir darauf aus anderen Begleitumständen einen Schluß ziehen. Ohne an dieser Stelle auf eine weitläufige Erklärung eingehen zu können, führe ich an, als

Comitatenses:	Pseudocomitatenses:
VII 99 Carronenses. ³⁶	VII 62 Catarienses.
100 Anderetiani.	105 Musmagenses.
101 Acincenses.	109 Abulci.
1) VI 48 equites cornuti seniores.	VII 162 equites cornuti seniores.
49 equites cornuti iuniores.	168 equites cornuti seniores.

Im Kapitel VII sollte einmal statt *seniores iuniores* stehen. An welcher Stelle die Berichtigung durchzuführen ist, läßt sich nicht feststellen, da wir weder aus der Reihenfolge in der Notitia dignitatum noch aus irgend welchen anderen Umständen einen Schluß ziehen können.

- m) VI 52 equites constantes Valentinianenses seniores.
VII 165 equites constantes Valentinianenses iuniores.

Da kaum anzunehmen ist, daß im Kapitel VI die *iuniores*, im Kapitel VII die *seniores* fehlen, so sollten die beiden Angaben gleichlautend sein, und zwar erachte ich die Korrektur in Kapitel VII auf *seniores* für die bessere, da die Zahl der fehlenden *seniores* geringer ist als die der *iuniores*.

n) VI 62 equites Constantiani felices. VII 178 equites Constantiaci feroces. Constantiani kommt in der Notitia dignitatum in gleicherweise vor wie Constantiaci; es läßt sich daher nicht feststellen, welche Form hier die richtige ist. Dagegen ist in Verbindung mit dem Kaisernamen die Bezeichnung *felices* wohl der Bezeichnung *feroces* vorzuziehen, die sich nur bei den Mauri (Occ. VI 61 = VII 164) findet.

o) VI 63 equites scutarii	VII 181 equites scutarii seniores
81 equites secundi scutarii	(Afrika).
iuniores.	195 equites scutarii iuniores
	(Afrika).
	197 equites scutarii iuniores
	scolae secundae
	(Afrika).
	201 equites scutarii Aureliaci
	(Britannien).
	207 equites scutarii seniores
	(Tingitanien).

³⁶ So richtig statt Garronenses.

Die *seniores* und *iuniores* des Kapitels VII in Afrika wurden im Kapitel V in eine Abteilung *scutarii* ohne weiteren Zusatz zusammengezogen, wie wir die in gleicher Weise bei den *septimani* sahen.³⁷ Das besondere Hervorheben der dritten afrikanischen Abteilung als *secundi iuniores* bzw. *iuniores scolae secundae* zeigt, daß hier eine Gruppe von 3 durch denselben Namen verbundenen Truppenkörpern geschaffen wurde, sei es auf einmal oder durch spätere Beifügung des dritten Gliedes. Wir sehen somit je eine Abteilung *seniores*, (*primi*) *iuniores* und *secundi iuniores*.

Die *seniores* in Tingitanien (VII 207), analog den afrikanischen *seniores* eine Vexillatio Comitatus, fehlen im Kapitel VI. Da das Kapitel VII älteren Datums ist als das Kapitel VI, so kann dieser Truppenkörper in der Zwischenzeit aus irgend einem Grunde verschwunden sein. Die *iuniores* zu VII 207 fehlen gänzlich. In den britannischen equites scutarii Aureliaci dürfen wir sie wohl schwerlich suchen, da diese, nach ihrem Namen zu schließen, eine unabhängige Abteilung bildeten.

p) VI 64 equites stablesiani Africani. VII 182 equites stablesiani seniores. Diese verschiedenen Namen beziehen sich auf denselben Truppenkörper. Die *iuniores* fehlen; mit den equites stablesiani Italiciani (Occ. VI 82 = VII 180) sind sie nicht identisch, da diese sonst gewiß in den beiden Kapiteln analog wie Occ. VI 64 = VII 182 behandelt und im ersteren als Italiciani, im letzteren als *iuniores* aufgezählt worden wären. Die equites stablesiani in Britannien (Occ. VII 203) sind allem Anscheine nach eine selbständige Abteilung.

q) VII 200 equites catafractarii iuniores. 201 equites scutarii Aureliaci. 202/05 equites Honoriani Taifali seniores. 203 equites stablesiani. 204 equites Syri.—Das Fehlen dieser Abteilungen in dem jüngeren Kapitel VI wurde oben auf den Abzug des britannischen Feldheeres nach Italien (winter 401/02) zurückgeführt.

Die equites Honoriani seniores (VII 202) und die equites Taifali (VII 205) habe ich in eine Abteilung zusammengezogen, da wir, bei der Leseart der Notitia dignitatum bleibend, außer

³⁷ Ebenso auch bei den Honoriani Marcomanni seniores und iuniores (Occ. V 198; 199), die im Kapitel VII in eine Abteilung Marcomanni (VII 38) zusammengezogen sind.

den im Kapitel VI fehlenden britannischen Reiterregimentern auch noch je eine in den Kapiteln VI und VII fehlende Abteilung Honoriani iuniores und Honoriani Taifali seniores annehmen müßten. Die doppelte Zählung der Honoriani Taifali seniores als Honoriani seniores und als Taifali denke ich mir dadurch entstanden, daß diese Abteilung auf zwei Stationen aufgeteilt war, und diese Gruppen im landläufigen Sprachgebrauch, vielleicht auch zur Unterscheidung von einander, verschieden d. h. mit anderen Teilen des vollen Namens bezeichnet wurden. Aus dem Vergleich mit anderen Reiterabteilungen³⁸ desselben oder ähnlichen Namens geht hervor, daß alle 5 britannischen Reiterregimenter Vexillationes Comitatuses waren.

r) VII 207 equites scutarii seniores.—vgl. unter o).

s) V 183 Augustei. 217 felices iuniores Gallicani.—Diese beiden Auxilia Palatina fehlen im Kapitel VII. Wir wissen daher nicht, welchem Feldheer sie angehörten. Die felices iuniores Gallicani werden wir mit ziemlicher Sicherheit dem Magister Equitum Galliarum zuweisen dürfen, in dessen Heere sich zahlreiche Gallicani befinden. Die Augustei waren vielleicht dem Comes Africae unterstellt, da dieser, trotz der sonstigen Stärke seines Feldheeres, im anderen Falle nur über ein einziges Auxilium Palatinum verfügt hätte, und wohl auch hier, wie in Tingitanien, an eine paarweise Einteilung zu denken ist.³⁹

t) V 261 Taurunenses. 262 Antianenses.—Gemäß der Art ihrer Errichtung standen alle Pseudocomitatenses grundsätzlich im Verbande jener Heere, zu denen die Provinz gehörte, aus der sie hervorgegangen waren. Nur von den nach Grenzlegionen benannten Pseudocomitatenses bilden einige eine Ausnahme von dieser Regel. Mithin werden wir hier mit ziemlicher Gewißheit annehmen dürfen, daß diese beiden Legionen dem Comes Illyrici unterstanden, zu dessen Amtsbereich auch die Provinzen Pannonia II und Valeria gehörten, in denen Taurunum und Antiana lagen.

³⁸ Or. VI 35 equites catafractarii; vgl. auch Parthi, Marcomanni etc.; Honoriani Taifali iuniores (Occ. VI 59 = VII 172).

³⁹ Die Beliebtheit der paarweisen Zusammenfassung ergibt sich auch daraus, daß z. B. die Namen von Auxilien des Feldheeres, die bei Ammian paarweise genannt werden, auch im Kapitel VII der Notitia Occidentis unmittelbar neben einander stehen.

u) VI 75 *comites iuniores*. 77 *equites sagittarii iuniores*. 85 *cuneus equitum promotorum*.—So wenig Verlaß auch im allgemeinen auf die Reihenfolge in den Kapiteln VI und VII—was die unterbrochene Aufeinanderfolge anbelangt—ist, in diesem Falle gibt sie doch anscheinend ganz verläßlichen Aufschluß über die Einteilung der hier genannten 3 Vexillationen. Die *comites iuniores* und die *sagittarii iuniores* stehen nämlich in der Mitte einer langen ununterbrochnen Reihe von Reiterregimentern, die alle dem Comes Africae unterstellt sind. Es besteht daher gar keine Veranlassung, sie einer anderen Provinz zuweisen zu wollen. Aehnlich der *cuneus equitum promotorum*; er wird in Kapitel VI als letzter Truppenkörper aufgezählt und die vorangehenden Abteilungen gehören der Provinz Tingitanien an, in der daher wohl auch unser Cuneus zu suchen sein wird.

Zu den hier besprochenen Fehlern kommt noch eine ganze Reihe von kleineren Abweichungen zwischen dem Texte der Kapitel V und VI und dem Kapitel VII, deren Erklärung jedoch so einfach ist, daß in den meisten Fällen der bloße Hinweis genügen wird:

v) V 177 *Salii* = VII 67 *Salii seniores*.

V 210 *Salii Gallicani* = VII 129 *Salii iuniores Gallicani*.

Der Zusatz *Gallicani* zeigt unzweideutig, welche Abteilungen der beiden Kapitel einander entsprechen. Die *iuniores* ohne den Zusatz *Gallicani* fehlen in beiden Listen.

w) V 181 *Gratianenses seniores* = VII 68 *Gratianenses*.—Da die *Gratianenses iuniores* gegeben sind (V 189 = VII 37), steht die Ergänzung *seniores* zu VII 68 zweifellos fest.

x) V 57 *Britannici* = V 206 *invicti iuniores Britannici* = VII 127 *invicti iuniores Britones*.

V 59 *exculcatores* = V 207 *exculcatores iuniores Britannici* = VII 73 *Britones*. In gleicher Weise, wie bei der ersten Abteilung, deren Zusammengehörigkeit durch das Wort "*invicti*" erwiesen ist, sehen wir auch bei der zweiten einmal die Form *Britannici*, das anderemal *Britones*, nur ist überdies bei VII 73 noch der weitere Zusatz entfallen. Wollten wir in V 207 und VII 73 zwei verschiedene Truppenkörper sehen, wozu nicht die geringste Veranlassung besteht, so würden in beiden

Kapiteln die entsprechenden Formationen, mithin weitere zwei Abteilungen fehlen.

y) V 67 Honoriani iuniores = V 215 Honoriani victores iuniores = VII 48 Honoriani victores.

z) V 72 = 220 Honoriani Gallicani = VII 52 matiarum Honoriani Gallicani. Seeck⁴⁰ bemerkt hiezu: "*Mattiarum praeter hos inter auxilia non reperies itaque aut ex Cod. V. Mauri recipiendum erat, aut Mattiaci, quod edit. Gelen. praebet.*" Zieht man in Betracht, was Seeck an anderer Stelle⁴¹ über die Verlässlichkeit des Codex Vindobonensis sagt, so ist der Lesung Mauri entschieden der Vorzug zu geben, umsomehr als zu den Mattiaci bereits eine Abteilung Gallicani vorhanden ist (Occ. V 209 = VII 77), zu den Honoriani Mauri aber nicht.

a1) VI 54 Equites armigeri = VII equites armigeri seniores. — Die zu diesem Paar gehörigen *iuniores* fehlen, dagegen steht ein zweifellos zusammengehöriges Paar *seniores* und *iuniores* in Afrika.

b1) VI 59 equites Honoriani Taifali iuniores = VII 172 equites Honoriani iuniores.

VI 67 equites sagittarii clibanarii = VII 185 equites clibanarii.

In diesen beiden Fällen handelt es sich lediglich um Abkürzungen der Namen im Kapitel VII. Wollten wir in den Abteilungen der Kapitel VI und VII verschiedene Truppenkörper erblicken, so würden wir dem Texte Gewalt antun und die Zahl der tatsächlichen Auslassungen zwecklos vermehren.

Außer diesen Berichtigungen, welche Truppenkörper der Feldheere betreffen, erscheint auch noch an einigen anderen Stellen eine Korrektur erforderlich:

Dux Germaniae secundae.

Im Kapitel I der Notitia Occidentis fehlt unter den Duces duodecim der von Germania II, dagegen wird der von Germania I genannt, obwohl auch der Comes Argentoratensis und die Duces Sequaniae und Mogontiacensis — demnach die Militärkom-

⁴⁰ Not. dign. S. 135 Anm. 9

⁴¹ Zur Kritik der Notitia dignitatum, S. 202.

mandanten aller 3 Provinzen, in welche Germania I (superior) aufgelöst erscheint—angeführt werden. Daß hier eine Doppelzählung stattfindet, geht schon daraus hervor, daß bei der jetzt üblichen Lesung der Dux Germaniae primae, der als der Befehlshaber über die Truppen der ganzen Provinz naturgemäß über den 3 Teilkommandanten stehen müßte, als Dux einen niedrigeren Rang einnimmt, als sein Untergebener, der Comes tractus Argentoratensis. Dies kann nicht richtig sein, vielmehr muß Occ. I 47 aus "Germaniae primae" (I) in "Germaniae secundae" (II) verbessert werden. Dann ist die Rheingrenze in 4 Verteidigungsabschnitte geteilt, unter denen der tractus Argentoratensis durch den Rang seines Befehlshabers dieselbe Vorstellung einnimmt, wie dies in der Zivilverwaltung durch die Bezeichnung von Mogontiacum als "Metropolis civitas Magontiacensium" (G. VII 2) geschieht. Die Liste der Consulares enthält ganz richtig den von Germania I (Occ. I 71) und Germania II (Occ. I 72).⁴² Ebenso werden unter den 17 gallischen Provinzen, die zum Verwaltungsgebiet des Praefectus Praetorio Galliarum gehören, nur Germania I (Occ. III 17) und Germania II (Occ. III 18) aufgezählt,⁴³ so daß hier nicht dieselbe Unterteilung stattfindet wie im Militärwesen. Ein Irrtum ist hier vollkommen ausgeschlossen; wüßten wir nicht schon aus anderen Quellen—Inschriften, Militärdiplome etc.—daß Germania II dieselbe Provinz ist wie Germania inferior, so würde es uns durch die Stelle des Laterculus Polemii Silvii (P. II 12): "Germania secunda versus Britanniam" erklärt, und in gleicher Weise durch die Aufzählung der Civitates, getrennt für Germania I und II, in der Notitia Galliarum (G. VII und VIII).

Dux Libyarum.

Vom Kapitel Or. XXX Dux Libyarum ist uns nur die dritte Seite erhalten, die einen Teil (den Schluß) des Officium aufzählt. Verloren sind somit zwei Seiten (1 Blatt) mit den Abzeichen des Dux, der Aufzählung sämtlicher ihm unterstehender Truppen und dem Beginne des Officium. Ein Vergleich mit den anderen Kapiteln der Notitia Orientis zeigt, daß die erste Seite außer dem Titel und den Abzeichen noch die Zeile "*Sub dispo-*

⁴² Analog die Gliederung beim Vicarius septem provinciarum.

⁴³ Analog die Gliederung in V. VIII 4; 5; P. 11; 12.

sitione viri spectabilis ducis Libyarum“ und vermutlich einen Truppenkörper enthalten haben muß, während von dem *Officium* am Schluß der zweiten Seite die Zeilen:

“1 *Officium autem habet ita:*

2 *Principem de scola agentum in rebus.*”

standen. Den Rest der zweiten Seite nahm die Aufzählung der Truppenkörper ein, die durch die Zeile: “*Et quae de minore laterculo emittuntur:*” in zwei Teile geschieden war. Die zweite Seite enthält durchschnittlich 22 bis 24 Zeilen; zieht man die 3 Zeilen mit anderem Texte ab und zählt den einen Truppenkörper von der ersten Seite dazu, so ergibt sich die Stärke des *Exercitus* von Libyen mit 20 bis 22 Truppenkörpern, mithin fast gleich stark wie jener des *Limes Aegypti* (Or. XXVIII), der ohne die Truppen der Provinz *Augustamnica* 20 Abteilungen hat u.zw. 2 *Equites*, 3 *Alae*, 4 *Legionsdetachements* im Hauptverzeichnis, 11 *Alae*, 2 *Cohortes* im *Laterculus minor*. Da in sämtlichen Grenzducaten des *Orients* *Legiones* oder *Legionsteile* stehen, so werden wir dies auch für Libyen annehmen müssen. Zweifelhaft ist, ob es ganze *Legiones* mit einem Sollstande von 5500 Mann oder nur *Legionsdetachements* zu 1000 Mann waren, wie die 4 im *Limes Aegypti* eingeteilten. Berücksichtigen wir, daß Libyen und der *Limes Aegypti* Nachbarprovinzen waren und auch sonst in ihrer ganzen Organisation—im Gegensatze zur *Thebais*—viele Analogien zeigen, so werden wir kaum fehlgehen, wenn wir diese Gleichartigkeit auch für die Art der Truppenkörper annehmen. In der verlorenen Liste des *Dux Libyarum* wären demnach 4 *Legionsdetachements* zu je 1000 Mann gestanden, ferner etwa 14 *Reiterregimenter* (*Equites* und *Alae*) und etwa 2 selbständige *Infanteriebataillone* (*Cohortes*).

Dux Pannoniae primae et Norici ripensis.

Die Provinzen *Pannonia I* und *Noricum ripense* stehen in der *Notitia dignitatum* militärisch unter einem gemeinsamen Oberbefehl. Es kann dies nur ein Zustand sein, der sich in einer sehr späten Zeit herausgebildet hat. *Diocletian*, der viele Provinzen, die er vorfand, in mehrere Teile zerlegte, hat gewiß die seit jeher bestehende Selbständigkeit der beiden Provinzen beibehalten. Dies geht schon daraus hervor, daß er die beiden Grenzheere mit je 2 *Legiones* einander gleichstellte. Auch unter

Constantin und seinen nächsten Nachfolgern wird die Selbständigkeit fortbestanden haben. Aus dem Umstande, daß das Verzeichnis der Stationen im Kapitel XXXIV nur die Festungen von Pannonia I, nicht aber jene von Noricum ripense enthält, schließe ich sogar, daß die Zusammenlegung der beiden Provinzen erst nach der Abfassung dieser Listen erfolgt ist, mithin in der Zeit zwischen dieser Abfassung (etwa 400) und der Schlußredaktion der *Notitia dignitatum* (437/38). Der Bearbeiter der *Notitia dignitatum* unter Theodosius II hätte demnach den zu seiner Zeit tatsächlich bestehenden Zustand dadurch herzustellen getrachtet, daß er alle Hinweise auf die militärische Selbständigkeit Noricums ausschaltete. Dies waren das Stationsverzeichnis und der Titel des Militärkommandanten am Kopfe des Kapitels über Noricum ripense und die Angabe des Dux im Kapitel I. Hiebei ist ihm dann freilich das Versehen unterlaufen, daß er das Stationsverzeichnis von Noricum ripense nicht in gleicher Weise an jenes von Pannonia I anfügte, wie er dies mit der Liste der Truppenkörper getan hat. An einen späteren zufälligen Verlust der ersten Seite von Noricum kann ich aus dem Grunde nicht glauben, weil in diesem Falle nicht alle sonstigen Spuren des Dux Norici ripensis getilgt wären. Auch ergibt sich aus verschiedenen Anzeichen (Legionsziegel etc.) der Schluß auf einen festeren Zusammenhang der beiden Provinzen für die spätrömische Zeit.

C. Ausgefallene Abteilungen.

Wie es bei einem so mächtigen Heere, gleich dem römischen, nicht anders möglich ist, sind im Laufe der Jahrzehnte und Jahrhunderte seines Bestandes manche Truppenkörper vernichtet oder auch aufgelöst worden, kurzum aus dem Gefüge der Wehrmacht verschwunden, ohne daß für sie ein gleichnamiger Ersatz geschaffen wurde. Eines der ältesten und wohl das bekannteste Beispiel aus der Kaiserzeit sind die 3 Legionen des Varus, mit den Nummern XVII, XVIII und XIX, die in der Schlacht im Teutoburger Walde durch die Germanen aufgerieben wurden und seither in den römischen Heereslisten fehlen.

Im Folgenden soll nun an der Hand der Verzeichnisse der *Notitia dignitatum* untersucht werden, welche fehlenden Abteilungen sich nachweisen lassen. Hiebei darf nicht übersehen

werden, daß die Heere des Ost- und des Westreiches jedes für sich selbständig aufgebaut sind und daß ein Uebergreifen, sei es durch fortlaufende Zählung, sei es durch die Beifügung von *seniores* und *iuniores*, von der einen in die andere Reichshälfte im Allgemeinen nicht stattfindet. Eine Ausnahme bilden nur die alten Grenzlegionen samt ihren Hilfstruppen, die aus ihren Vexillationen errichteten Neulegionen und einige Vexillationes Comitatuses "equites Dalmatae," mit den fortlaufenden Nummern von I bis IX. Dagegen sind die Reiterregimenter und die Legionen der Palatini und Comitatuses innerhalb jeder Reichshälfte zum Teil fortlaufend bezeichnet, indem bei gleichem Namen die ersteren *seniores*, die letzteren *iuniores* sind. Auf die Pseudocomitatuses greifen diese Bezeichnungen nicht über.

Stellt man alle durch ihre Nummern, durch *seniores-iuniores* oder durch sonstige Merkmale als zusammengehörig erkenntlichen Abteilungen zusammen (indem man jede Reichshälfte als eine selbständige Einheit behandelt) und scheidet alle als vollständige Gruppen erkenntlichen aus, so bleibt eine Anzahl von Formationen übrig, zu denen teils die zugehörigen Abteilungen zweifellos fehlen, teils nicht deutlich und unzweifelhaft erkenntlich sind. Die Feststellung mancher dieser Abteilungen ist nur auf Grund eingehender Untersuchungen möglich, die einer späteren Besprechung vorbehalten bleiben müssen. Vorgreifend sollen jedoch bereits hier alle Gruppen zusammengestellt werden, in denen sich fehlende Abteilungen nachweisen lassen, um ein übersichtliches Bild des Wandels des römischen Heerwesens zu geben.

Reiterei der Feldheere. Orient.

Vexillationes Palatinae:	VII 25 comites catafractarii Buccellarii iuniores.
V 30 comites sagittarii iuniores.	
VI 28 comites seniores.	26 equites armigeri sen. Orientales.
29 equites brachiati iuniores.	
30 equites Batavi iuniores.	28 equites primi scutarii Orientales.
Vexillationes Comitatuses:	29 equites secundi stablesiani.
V 35 equites armigeri sen. Gallicani.	30 equites tertii stablesiani.
40 equites primi clibanarii Parthi.	32 equites quarti clibanarii Parthi.
VI 40 equites secundi clibanarii Parthi.	33 equites primi sagittarii.

34 cuneus equitum secundorum clibanariorum Palmirenorum.	IX 19 equites sagittarii seniores. 20 equites Germaniciiani seniores.
VIII 32 equites primi Theodosiani.	

Dieses Verzeichnis zeigt ganz bedeutende Lücken. Zunächst fehlen zweifellos, wie aus der Zählung, sowie aus der Beifügung seniores bzw. iuniores hervorgeht:

equites primi stablesiani (Com.)	Equites brachiati seniores (Pal.)
equites tertii clibanarii Parthi (Com.)	equites Batavi seniores (Pal.)
cuneus equitum primorum clibanariorum Palmirenorum (Com.)	comites catafractarii Bucellarii seniores (Com.)
comites sagittarii seniores (Pal.)	equites armigeri Orientales iun. (Com.)
equites armigeri Gallicani iun. (Com.)	equites sagittarii iuniores (Com.)
comites iuniores (Pal.)	equites Germaniciiani iuniores (Com.)

Wo *seniores* vorkommen, müssen auch *iuniores* gewesen sein und umgekehrt; das Vorkommen von Abteilungen mit der Nummer I ist jedoch noch kein Beweis dafür, daß Formationen desselben Namens mit höheren Nummern bestanden haben. Wir müssen vielmehr mit derartigen Schlüssen sehr vorsichtig sein, wenn nicht noch weitere Anhaltspunkte vorliegen. Es gibt im römischen Heere so viele alleinstehende Truppenkörper mit der Nummer I, daß daraus deutlich hervorgeht, daß manche von ihnen nie Nachfolger erhalten haben. Diesen Grundsatz möchte ich in dem vorliegenden Falle auf die *equites primi Theodosiani* anwenden. Anders bei den *equites primi scutarii Orientales*, die ihren Beinamen, gleich Or. VII 26, davon haben, daß sie im Feldheere des *Magister Militum per Orientem* eingeteilt waren, und bei den *equites primi sagittarii*. Eine Zusammenstellung zeigt uns nämlich, daß die *sagittarii* in den Feldheeren des Ostreiches fast ausnahmslos paarweise standen. Die in der *Notitia dignitatum* fehlenden Abteilungen sind in Klammer [. . .] gesetzt:

Magister Militum praesentalis I:	[comites sagittarii seniores (Pal.)] comites sagittarii iuniores (Pal.).
Magister Militum praesentalis II:	comites sagittarii Armeni (Com.).
Magister Militum per Orientem:	equites primi sagittarii (Com.) [equites secundi sagittarii (Com.)]

Magister Militum per Thracias:	equites sagittarii seniores (Com.) equites sagittarii iuniores (Com.).
Magister Militum per Illyricum:	equites sagittarii seniores (Com.) [equites sagittarii iuniores (Com.)]

Ebenso standen die scutarii durchwegs paarweise mit Ausnahme der equites scutarii (Or. VI 39) und der equites scutarii Aureliaci (Occ. VII 201), die aber auch keine Nummer tragen. Wir erhalten somit als weitere fehlende Abteilungen:

equites secundi scutarii Orientales (Com.)
equites secundi sagittarii (Com.)

Occident.

Im Occident bleiben uns nach Vornahme der Ausscheidung folgende Fragmente:

- Occ. VI 10 = 52 equites constantes Valentinianenses seniores = VII
165 equites constantes Valentinianenses iuniores (Pal.).
VI 11 = 54 = VII 173 equites armigeri seniores (Com.).
VI 12 = 55 = VII 176 equites primi Gallicani (Com.).
VI 21 = 64 equites stablesiani Africani = VII 182 equites stable-
siani seniores (Com.).
VII 200 equites catafractarii iuniores [(Com.)].
VII 207 equites armigeri seniores [(Com.)].

Die equites primi Gallicani können wir auf Grund unserer früheren Erwägungen über die Truppenkörper mit der Nummer I ausschalten, indem wir sie als eine alleinstehende Abteilung betrachten. Betreffs der übrigen Abteilungen verweise ich auf die vorangehenden Ausführungen bei den Reiterregimentern des Orients. Als fehlend haben wir demnach im Westreiche folgende Reiterregimenter zu verzeichnen:

equites constantes Valentinianenses seniores oder iuniores (je nachdem wir den Angaben des Kapitels VII oder VI folgen.—Pal.).
equites armigeri iuniores (Com. in Gallien).
equites stablesiani iuniores (Com. in Afrika.)
equites catafractarii seniores (Com.).
equites scutarii iuniores (Com. in Tingitanien(?)).

Hiezu kommen noch einige Abteilungen der equites Dalmatae, deren Zählung in beiden Reichshälften fortlaufend ist, so daß sich nicht feststellen läßt, welcher die fehlenden angehörten. Wir kennen aus der Notitia dignitatum die Vexillationes Comita-

tenses mit den Nummern III, V, VI, IX (Orient), VIII (Occident). Es fehlen mithin:

equites primo Dalmatae (Com.). equites quarto Dalmatae (Com.).
equites secundo Dalmatae (Com.). equites septimo Dalmatae (Com.).

von denen eine Abteilung anscheinend in den Equites Dalmatae Passerentienses steckt.

Legionen der Feldheere und Pseudocomitatenses.

Bei den Legiones Palatinae, Comitatus und Pseudocomitatenses ergibt sich folgender Rückstand:

Orient:		Occident:	
VII 40 Martenses seniores (Com.).	V 147 = VII 5 divitenses seniores (Pal.)		
46 II felix Valentis (Com.).	148 = 6 Tungrecani seniores (Pal.)		
VIII 34 solenses seniores (Com.).	150 = 8 Moesiaci seniores (Pal.)		
42 Constantini seniores (Com.).	224 = 83 Menapii seniores (Com.).		
43 divitenses Gallicani (Com.).	227 = 80 armigeri defensores seniores (Com.).		
45 Constantini Dafnenses (Com.).			
50 solenses Gallicani (Com.).	232 = 30 mattiarii iuniores (Com.).		
IX 32 Britones seniores (Pal.).	253 = 149 (oder VII 138) II Flaviae Constantianae (Com.).		
38 lanciarii iuniores (Com.).			
41 felices Theodosiani iuniores (Pseud.).	270 = 96 superventores iuniores (Pseud.).		
46 secundi Theodosiani (Pseud.).			

Aus den Nummern, sowie aus den Zusätzen seniores bzw. iuniores ergibt sich das Fehlen folgender Abteilungen:

I felix Valentis (Com., Or.).	Tungrecani iuniores (Com., Occ.).
I Flavia Constantianae (Com., Occ.).	Menapii iuniores (Com., Occ.).
primi Theodosiani (Pseud., Or.).	armigeri defensores iuniores (Com., Occ.).
Martenses iuniores (Com., Or.).	mattiarii seniores (Com., Occ.).
lanciarii seniores (Com., Or.).	superventores seniores (Pseud., Occ.).
felices Theodosiani seniores (Pseud., Or.).	

Die zu den Constantini seniores fehlenden iuniores werden wir wohl nicht in den Constantini Dafnenses suchen dürfen. Die Constantini seniores und iuniores stehen gleich den milites Constantini (Or. XXXIX 23; 25; 26; XL 20; 24; 26) in unmittelbarem Zusammenhang mit dem Kaisernamen. Die Constantini Dafnenses hingegen sind nach dem Kastell Daphne in Moesia II am Ister (Ammian XXVII 5) benannt, das von Constantin erbaut war, weshalb sich auch auf Münzen zum Unter-

schied von anderen Orten des gleichen Namens die Bezeichnung Constantiniana Dafne findet. Wir müssen daher die Constantini Dafnenses von den Constantini seniores scharf trennen und rechnen als fehlend:

Constantini iuniores (Com., Or.).

Bezüglich der divitenses und solenses vermute ich, daß ursprünglich von ersteren je eine Legion in beiden Reichshälften stand, während die letzteren, auch nur mit einer Abteilung, bloß im Orient vertreten waren. Die divitenses des Westreiches und die solenses wurden später, wie zahlreiche andere Abteilungen, durch Bildung von *seniores* und *iuniores* verdoppelt, die divitenses des Ostreiches blieben unverändert. Verloren gingen in der Folge:

divitenses iuniores (Com., Occ.).

Die divitenses des Ostreiches jedoch und die solenses [*iuniores*], die beide in Thrakien standen, erhielten aus irgend einem Anlaß den Beinamen Gallicani, unter dem sie uns in der Notitia dignitatum begegnen. Von Honorius, dem wir sonst zahlreiche Galliani nachweisen können, stammen die Beinamen in diesem Falle nicht, da sich seine Namensgebung infolge der Reichsteilung auf den Occident beschränkte.—

Unter den Legiones Palatinae des Occidents nennt die Notitia dignitatum auch die Moesiaci seniores, im Orient die Britones seniores. Wie die Analogie der Pannoniciani (Occ. V 149 = VII 7; Or. VIII 48) und zum Teil auch der Germaniciani (Occ. V 236 = VII 33; Or. IX 34) lehrt, war die jüngere Abteilung dieser Gruppen stets Comitatus und je eine — seniores oder iuniores — stand im Ostreiche, die andere im Westreiche. Ich verzeichne demnach als fehlend:

Britones iuniores (Com., Occ.). Moesiaci iuniores (Com., Or.).

Von Pannonien bis an das Schwarze Meer sind alle Provinzen durch Legionen vertreten, die ihre Namen tragen, und zwar alle jene Provinzen, von denen es eine superior (I) und eine inferior (II) gibt, durch 2 Legionen, die einfachen Provinzen durch eine Legion. Nur Noricum und die Valeria fehlen in dieser Reihe obwohl sie sonst zahlreiche Legionsvexillationen abgegeben haben. Wir erhalten daher als fehlend:

Norici (Com., Or.). Valeriani (Pal., Occ.).

Zu dieser Einteilung führt mich die Symmetrie in der Aufteilung der derart benannten Truppenkörper auf die beiden Reichshälften. Ihr Rang ergibt sich aus dem Vergleich mit den anderen derart benannten Abteilungen, sowie aus dem Range der betreffenden Provinzen.

Aus Ammian (XVIII 9) läßt sich schließlich noch das Bestehen einer Legion, vermutlich Comitatus, nachweisen, die im Jahre 359 beim Fall von Amida vernichtet wurde:

tricesimani (Com., Or.),

ferner die eine in der Notitia dignitatum fehlende parthische Legion, die jedenfalls mit der VI. desselben Namens (Or. VII 55) ein Paar bildete und gleich ihr Pseudocomitatus war. In demselben Kapitel (XVIII 9) nennt Ammian noch zwei sonst nicht bekannte Abteilungen, superventores und praeventores. Die superventores im Occident (V 270 = VII 96) sind Pseudocomitatus, daher wird für den Orient dasselbe gelten. Die paarweise Nennung mit den superventores, sowie der Name selbst—vgl. defensores, exploratores, insidiatores—weist darauf hin, daß die praeventores derselben Kategorie angehörten:

V Parthica; superventores; praeventores (Pseud., Or.).

Die Notitia Occidentis (V 268 = VII 94) zählt eine Legio Pseudocomitatus Mauri Osismiaci auf. Im Kapitel XXXVII sehen wir neben einander:

- 16 praefectus militum Maurorum Benetorum (richtig Venetorum).
- 17 praefectus militum Maurorum Osismiacorum.

Aus dieser Analogie läßt sich der Schluß auf das ehemalige Bestehen von

Mauri Veneti (Pseud., Occ.) ziehen.

Auxilia des Feldheeres.

Verhältnismäßig gering ist die Zahl der Auxilia Palatina, die sich namentlich als fehlend nachweisen lassen. Dieser Umstand berechtigt jedoch keineswegs zu der Annahme, daß dieselben von Constantin bis zum Anfang des 4. Jahrhunderts so wenige Veränderungen erlitten haben; er ist vielmehr darauf zurückzuführen, daß zahlreiche einzelnstehende Abteilungen dieser Gattung bestanden, die bei ihrem Untergange nicht, wie die mit

fortlaufenden Nummern oder mit seniores-iuniores bezeichneten, eine Spur hinterließen.

Bei der Durchsicht der Auxilia Palatina ergeben sich Lücken in folgenden Gruppen:

Orient:		Occident:	
V 49 Batavi seniores.		V 160 = VII 11 petulantes seniores.	
50 brachiati iuniores.	162 =	13 Heruli seniores.	
56 tertii sagittarii Valentis.	177 =	67 Salii seniores.	
IX 26 petulantes iuniores.	182 =	125 invicti seniores.	
28 invicti iuniores.	215 =	48 Honoriani victores iuniores.	
	216 =	79 Honoriani ascarii seniores.	

Nach den Nummern oder der Beifügung seniores bzw. iuniores lassen sich folgende Abteilungen als fehlend nachweisen:

primi sagittarii Valentis (Or.).	petulantes seniores (Or.).
secundi sagittarii Valentis (Or.).	invicti seniores (Or.).
Batavi iuniores (Or.).	petulantes iuniores (Occ.).
brachiati seniores (Or.).	invicti iuniores (Occ.).

Von allen diesen Auxilia Palatina stand sowohl im Orient wie im Occident je ein Paar. Daß von den invicti und den petulantes nur je eine Abteilung u. zw. in beiden Fällen im Orient die iuniores, im Occident die seniores erhalten sind, beruht auf einem bloßen Zufall. Es läßt sich bei dieser Truppengattung nicht ein einziger Fall nachweisen, daß die Bezeichnung aus der einen in die andere Reichshälfte übergegriffen hätte. Auch daran, daß die iuniores jener Teil der petulantes seien, den Julian in Gallien zur Abgabe an Constantius bereitgestellt hatte (Ammian XX 4), und den er dann auf seinem Zuge aus Gallien mitnahm, ist nicht zu denken, da es sich dort nur um ein Detachement, nicht aber um eine vollzählige Abteilung handelte.

Die invicti iuniores Britannici (Occ. V 206 = VII 127) sind nicht die zu dem occidentalen Paare fehlenden iuniores, sondern wie alle derartigen Abteilungen, die den Zusatz Gallicani oder Britannici tragen, ein dem alten Paare nachträglich angehängtes drittes Glied. Da der einzige Kaisername, der mehrmals mit Gallicani in Verbindung steht, der des Honorius ist,⁴⁴ so werden wir gewiß alle so benannten Auxilia Palatina

⁴⁴ Honoriani felices Gallicani (Occ. V 247 = VII 89); lanciarii Gallicani Honoriani (Occ. V 239 = VII 81).

auf ihn zurückführen dürfen. Die sagittarii Gallicani (Or. V 54; 55) gehen wohl auf Constantin zurück, doch darf man sie nicht als Ausnahme betrachten, da sie im Orient stehen, wo dem Honorius nicht das Recht der Namensgebung zustand, und es sich überdies um eine Truppe seniores—iuniores handelt, deren Name sie von den sagittarii Orientales seniores und iuniores (Or. VI 54; 55) unterscheiden soll. Die Gegenüberstellung von Gallicani und Orientales zeigt sich schon in der Einteilung der ersteren beim Magister Militum praesentalis I, der letzteren beim Magister Militum praesentalis II, dann auch in der ganz übereinstimmenden Aufzählung—beide seniores als sechstes, beide iuniores als siebentes Auxilium Palatinum. Während die Gallicani des Westreiches ihren Namen von Gallien haben, dürfte er im Ostreiche, gleich der Legio III Gallica, auf die Galater hinweisen.

Bei den Gallicani und Britanniciani fällt aber noch eine weitere höchst merkwürdige Erscheinung auf; es gibt keine seniores dieses Namens. Beachtenswert ist auch die Stellung des Wortes iuniores. Dieses steht, wenn es richtig gesetzt ist, stets vor Gallicani bzw. Britanniciani, wodurch gezeigt wird, daß es nicht zu diesen Gallicani oder Britanniciani, sondern zu dem vorangehenden Teile des Namens gehört und daß Gallicani bzw. Britanniciani ein weiterer Zusatz ist:

invicti seniores	invicti iuniores	invicti iuniores Britanniciani
Mattiaci seniores	Mattiaci iuniores	Mattiaci iuniores Gallicani
Jovii seniores	Jovii iuniores	Jovii iuniores Gallicani
Salii seniores	[Salii iuniores]	Salii iuniores Gallicani
victores seniores	victores iuniores	victores iuniores Britanniciani
exculcatores seniores	exculcatores iuniores	exculcatores iun. Britanniciani
felices seniores	felices iuniores	felices iun. Gallicani
sagittarii Nervii		sagittarii Nervii Gallicani
Honoriani Atecotti sen.	Honoriani Atecotti iun.	[Honoriani] Atecotti iun. Gallicani
Honoriani Mauri sen.	Honoriani Mauri iun.	Honoriani Mauri [iun.] Gallicani.

In ähnlicher Weise aufgebaut, daher wohl auch dem Honorius zuzuschreiben, ist das dritte Glied der Gruppe:

equites scutarii sen.—equites scutarii iun.—equites secundi
scutarii iun. (Com., Occ.).

Bei allen diesen Abteilungen—abgesehen von den alleinstehenden Nervii—fand Honorius die seniores und iuniores vor. Anläß-

lich einer Truppenvermehrung ⁴⁵—es muß dies die zweite während seiner Regierung gewesen sein, da auch schon einige neu von ihm errichtete Auxilia Palatina ein drittes Glied erhielten—wurde aus irgendwelchen Gründen ein von dem früher gebräuchlichen abweichender Vorgang eingeschlagen; eine Reihe von Legionspaaren wurde auf Gruppen zu je 3 ergänzt, von denen eine Abteilung seniores und zwei iuniores waren. Die jüngeren iuniores nannte man nach Ergänzung, Dislokation oder ähnlichem "Gallicani" bezw. "Britannici".

Auf Grund dieser Ausführungen können wir daher als fehlend bezeichnen:

Salii iuniores. Heruli iuniores. Honoriani victores seniores.
Honoriani ascarii iuniores (alle 4 im Occ.).

Die Legionen der Grenzheere.

Von den alten Grenzlegionen fehlen, wie der Vergleich mit Cassius Dio und den vatikanischen Säulen zeigt, sieben:

⁴⁵ Anlässlich der Aufstellung des Expeditionskorps gegen Gildo (Herbst 397) erwähnt Claudian (bell. Gild. 418 ff.), daß zum Teil alte, zum Teil neuaufgestellte Truppenkörper eingeteilt wurden, und nennt ihre Namen:

*Herculeam suus Alcides Joviamque cohortem
Rex ducit superum, premitur nec signifer ullo
Pondere; festinant adeo vexilla moveri.
Nervius insequitur meritusque vocabula Felix
Dictaque ab Augusto legio nomenque probantes
Invicti clipeoque animosi teste Leones.*

In der Not. dign. (Occ.) lassen sich hievon nachweisen:

cohors Jovia	= V 212 (= VII 76) Jovii iuniores Gallicani,
Nervius	= V 211 (= VII 75) sagittarii Nervii Gallicani,
Felix	= VII 217 felices iuniores Gallicani,
legio Augusta	= V 254 (= VII 151) tertio Augustani,
Invicti	= V 206 (= VII 127) invicti iuniores Britannici,
Leones	= V 171 (= VII 65) leones seniores oder V 172 (= VII 19) leones iuniores, falls nicht—was aber weniger wahrscheinlich ist—eine in der Not. dign. nicht mehr erscheinende Abteilung leones iuniores Gallicani damals errichtet wurde.

cohors Herculeia muß eine Abteilung des Feldheeres (legio oder aux. pal.) gewesen sein. Ein aux. pal. dieses Namens ist in der Not. dign. nicht nachweisbar. Vielleicht ist die

Britannia superior: XX Valeria victrix.
 Germania inferior: I Minervia, XXX Ulpia victrix.
 Germania superior: VIII Augusta, XXII Primigenia.
 Judaea: VI ferrata.
 Numidia: III Augusta.

Das Fehlen der britannischen Legion geht darauf zurück, daß Britannia prima unter Diocletian in 3 selbständige Provinzen zerlegt wurde und daß das Kapitel über die neue Provinz, welcher die XX Valeria nun angehörte, in der Notitia dignitatum nicht enthalten ist. Die 4 germanischen Legionen bestanden, wie der ganze Aufbau der Grenzverteidigung in den betreffenden Kapiteln der Notitia dignitatum zeigt, zu dieser Zeit nicht mehr. Ob die VI ferrata in Palästina eingegangen ist oder ob sie bloß infolge eines Versehens im Kapitel Or. XXXIV fehlt, mag dahingestellt bleiben.

Von den Legionen, die Diocletian nach dem Muster der alten Grenzlegionen errichtete und die in der Notitia dignitatum in verschiedener Gestalt erhalten sind, fehlt eine in der Gruppe:

Or. XXXIX: I Jovia, II Herculia (Riparienses).
 Occ. V 238 = VII 54: III Herculea (Comitatensis).
 Occ. XXXII: V Jovia, VI Herculea (Riparienses).

Während von der ehemaligen Grenzlegion III Herculea nur mehr ein Teil als Legio Comitatensis erhalten ist, scheinen Teile der fehlenden sechsten Legion, die den Namen IV Jovia geführt haben muß, in den Jovii seniores (Occ. V 168 = VII 16) und den Jovii iuniores (Occ. V 184 = VII 42), zwei Auxilia Palatina, weiterbestanden zu haben.

Die Hilfstruppen der Grenzheere.

Bei den Hilfstruppen der Grenzheere sind die Lücken ungleich größer als bei allen anderen Formationen. Die Ursache hiefür liegt in einer ganzen Reihe von Umständen, zunächst im Wesen der Hilfstruppen. Mommsen⁴⁶ weist darauf hin, daß anscheinend das Recht, Bürgertruppen d. h. Legionen aufzustellen, formell nur dem Senate zustand. Es bestand nun allerdings

leg. com. III Herculea gemeint (V 238 = VII 54) und Claudian nennt sie mit dichterischer Freiheit analog und als Gegenstück zur "cohors" Jovia Kohorte.

⁴⁶ Hermes XIX. S. 57 f.

keine Gefahr, daß der Senat die Erlaubnis hiezu versagt hätte. Einerseits wollten aber die Kaiser nicht durch ein derartiges Ansinnen die formelle höchste Souveränität des Senates neu deklarieren, anderseits aber auch nicht durch Errichtung von Legionen ohne Senatsbeschluß die gesetzlichen Schranken der kaiserlichen Kompetenz überschreiten. Unter diesen Umständen machten sie von ihrem Rechte, Hilfstruppen aufzustellen, um so eifriger Gebrauch, als sich diese auch sowohl durch den geringeren Sold, wie durch den Ausfall der Altersversorgung, die nur den Legionären gebührte, bedeutend billiger stellten. Es war ferner viel leichter für eine Abteilung von 500 oder 1000 Mann ein homogenes Material zu finden—und dieses mußte ja tunlichst angestrebt werden—als für eine Legion mit rund 6000 Mann. Benötigte man Truppen, so waren einige Auxilien rasch errichtet; hatte man keine Verwendung mehr für sie, so löste man sie auf, ohne auf Tradition oder ähnliche Momente Rücksicht nehmen zu müssen. Deshalb war aber die Zahl der Auxilien auch starken Schwankungen unterworfen, so daß wir schon aus diesem Grunde keine auch nur annähernd lückenlose Reihenfolge in den Listen erwarten dürfen.

Bei der ersten Aufstellung bestanden die Auxilien sicher aus Angehörigen derjenigen Völker, nach denen sie benannt waren. Es mag nun mitunter eine Aushebung nicht den erwarteten Erfolg gehabt haben, so daß nicht die ursprünglich geplante Zahl von Alen und Cohorten erreicht wurde und sich gleich zu Beginn Lücken in der Zählung ergaben. War diese somit schon sehr lückenhaft, als die Errichtung der selbständigen Feldheere erfolgte, so ist durch diese der größte Teil der alten Hilfstruppen verschwunden. Zum Teil wurden sie zur Bildung der Auxilia Palatina verwendet, zum Teil in Pseudocomitatenses umgewandelt; ein beträchtlicher Teil verblieb in den Grenzheeren, aber in geänderter Form, mit neuen Namen und Bezeichnungen. Nur ein geringer Rest erhielt sich in dem alten Gewande.

Wollten wir demnach alle in den Verzeichnissen der Notitia dignitatum fehlenden Hilfstruppen zusammenstellen, so würde ihre Zahl die der erhaltenen um ein vielfaches übertreffen, und überdies wäre es ein sehr undankbares Beginnen, weil wir von vielen nicht mit Sicherheit behaupten können, daß sie jemals bestanden haben.

ERNST VON NISCHER.

PARMENIDES AND THE *PARMENIDES* OF PLATO.

[The antinomies of the *Parmenides* were composed for the purpose of showing that the Eleatic dialectic of Zeno when applied to the monistic *Being* of Parmenides produces the same paradoxes as when used against pluralism. It is demonstrated that the second part of the dialogue is formally an elaborate parody of the poem of Parmenides and methodically a parody of the logic-chopping of Zeno. By this means the psychological purpose of the dialogue is elucidated, the unity of the dialogue is made evident, and its relationship to the *Sophist* is established.]

Of the numberless problems which commentators have found in the *Parmenides* of Plato the root has been the relationship of the second part of the dialogue to the first, for the two parts seem offhand to be connected only by the arbitrary decision of Parmenides to give an exhibition of dialectical research. More particularly scholars have fretted because in the first part of the dialogue Parmenides advances certain objections to the theory of Ideas which Socrates has presented, and these objections Socrates accepts with the result that Plato seems to admit their cogency. The long history of attempts to explain this shocking fact I shall not repeat here; the most ambitious of such attempts was Henry Jackson's reconstruction of the history of Plato's development which has had a vigorous and malign influence on Platonic studies in spite of the prompt and complete refutation of it given by Paul Shorey.¹ It is, however, serviceable to notice the method Jackson used in his research as far as that method can be followed in his writing, for in the method lies the reason for the results. The problem which he found in the text of the *Parmenides* he resolved by a subtle manipulation of that text and thereafter he sought to explain the dialogues related to the *Parmenides* by means of the theory he had evolved from the *Parmenides* itself, torturing them into a semblance of consistency with the solution he had already devised. I believe that it is necessary for us to examine certain of the dialogues which bear upon the *Parmenides* before we attempt to explain the *Parmenides* itself.

In the *Sophist* a serious investigation is made into the problem of predication, which turns upon the meaning of *Being* and

¹ *Recent Platonism in England* in A. J. P. IX, 1888.

non-Being. The Eleatic Stranger first taking up a quotation from the poem of Parmenides demonstrates in traditional Parmenidean style that *non-Being* can not be the object of thought or speech.² But he discovers in the process that this is a dangerous saying, for "*Non-Being* reduces its opponent to such helplessness that, whenever he attempts to refute it, it forces him in his very demonstration to contradict himself on the subject."³ The reason for this is that in the very act of saying that *Non-Being* cannot partake of unity or plurality, he has predicated unity of it, for he has uttered the term "*Non-Being*".⁴ Accordingly the Stranger decides that he must "put to the torture the doctrine of his father Parmenides,"⁵ and this he does by an examination of the concept of *Being*. His critique of those who say ἐν τὸ πᾶν I must briefly summarize.⁶

(1) Are *Being* and *Unity* two names for the same thing? To say there are two names when there is only one *Being* is absurd; even to say there is a name is meaningless, for if the name is other than the thing named, there are two things; but, if the name and the thing named be identified, the name is either the name of nothing or of itself, i. e. of a name. (Moreover, *Unity* is predicable of one thing only, but *Unity* is predicable of the name—if there be a name; in which case there would be two unities.⁷)

(2) If, as Parmenides says, *Being* is a totality, it has parts. As a whole having parts it may be a unit as partaking of *Unity*, but it cannot be *Unity* for *Unity* is without parts. If it is one by participation, it (*Being*) is distinct from *Unity*, and there arises a plurality of elements. If, to avoid this, we say *Being* is not a whole, though Totality exists, there is existence outside of *Being* and a plurality again. If totality does not exist, *Being*

² Sophist, 237A-238C.

³ Soph., 238D.

⁴ Soph., 238E.

⁵ Soph., 241D.

⁶ Soph., 244B-245E.

⁷ At 244D I would read καὶ τὸ ἐν γὰρ ἐπὶ μόνον καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸ τὸ ἐν ὅν "And the result will be that *Unity* is predicable of one thing only and on the other hand *Unity* is predicable of the name." The consequence of which is that, if they allow a name to exist, nothing can exist save the name, for otherwise there will be two *Unities*.

is still plurality (for *Being* is not, then, a whole); and it cannot have arisen nor can it exist, for nothing is completed but as a whole. Nor can it have number, for whatever number it has, it has as a whole or sum.

This section of the discussion is closed with the remark, "For a person who says that *Being* is some two things or only one, ten thousand other problems, each one comprising endless difficulties, will appear. . . . However, though we have not examined all the people who quibble about *Being* and *non-Being*,⁸ this is enough."

Thereafter there is an examination of "men who give other accounts" of *Being*, materialists and those who claim that true *Being* is immaterial and intelligible. But the purpose of the whole investigation is given explicitly by the Stranger in the words "in order that from every point of view we may see that it is no easier to say what *Being* is than what *Non-Being* is."⁹ The conclusion of the whole investigation is that *Non-Being* in a sense *exists* and in a sense *Being* does *not exist* exactly in proportion to the existence of *Otherness*.¹⁰ This is the germ of the entire dialogue. The *Theaetetus* in attempting to define knowledge used a negative approach, starting from opinion, and became entangled in *Non-Being* which, it was found, lay at the basis of false opinion. This is instructive for the understanding of Plato's apparent perversity of method, for in the *Sophist*, in attempting to define an *εἶδωλον*, i. e. some thing like to what is real but in itself unreal, he proceeds to the discussion of *Being*. If Heraclitus and his followers spent their time in showing the absurdity of a congealed *Being* and Zeno directed the Eleatic defence to the demonstration of the absurdity of *Non-Being*, Plato means to combine the negative arguments of both sides in these dialogues which form a great "Apologia pro doctrina sua" on ontological and epistemological grounds. If in a sense the negative arguments of both sides are true, there is need of

⁸ This phrase does not divide the schools meant (Eleatics, Heracliteans, etc.) into two groups as Campbell supposes, for both Eleatics and Heracliteans (and these for Plato subsumed under themselves the minor schools, cf. his remarks on Empedocles *Soph.* 242D) in speaking of the nature of *Being* felt it necessary to comment on *Non-Being*.

⁹ *Soph.*, 246A.

¹⁰ *Soph.*, 256D-257A.

a reconciliation of the two doctrines which split the world apart; and this, he means, is to be found in his own metaphysics which combines the irrefutable parts of the positive doctrine of both schools and stands on a more reasonable ontological basis.

The whole tangle of paradoxes is swept away, then, by the assertion that *Non-Being* does exist, for although it is impossible to think of *Non-Being* apart from *Being* it is no easier to conceive of *Being* without its complementary opposite. But before this conclusion is reached there is a lengthy examination of the champions of immaterial existence,¹¹ the first part of which demonstrates the necessity of a communion of opposites in their "pure Being," and shows that the conception of the existence which they sponsor is self-contradictory because it makes no provision for such a communion. It is from this criticism that the Stranger proceeds to set forth the doctrine of the communion of ideas and of the complementary existence of *Being* and *non-Being*. The conclusion of the discussion amounts to a complete denunciation of Parmenides. We have gone far beyond disobeying his express command, says the Stranger,¹² for we have not only spoken of *non-Being* and searched for it but have proved that it exists and have defined it. Now to go about trying to produce contradiction in argument is the act of a child who is just feeling his power, and to attempt to separate "the All" from everything is the unseemly action of an unlearned and unphilosophical person. This amounts to calling Parmenides the fountain-head of all Sophistry, for as the sophist is ἀντιλογικός, Parmenides, who by his dictum of *Non-Being* gave rise to all these senseless antinomies, is the most ἀντιλογικός of all.

At the beginning of the *Philebus*,¹³ too, Socrates comments upon the paradoxes which play about the concepts of *Unity* and *Plurality* ascribing the difficulty to the inherent weakness of human understanding and remarking that the trouble is not new and will not ever cease. He recognizes the difficulties which are caused by the problem in the theory of Ideas, but concludes that by a systematic dialectic coupled with a persistent faith in searching for the Idea of each thing we may avoid the pitfalls of eristic.

¹¹ Soph., 248A-258C.

¹² Soph., 258C-259E.

¹³ Phileb., 14C-17A.

This eristic is pointedly attributed in the *Phaedrus*¹⁴ to Zeno whom Socrates there calls "the Eleatic Palamedes," and his description of the effect of this process, "the result is that to his audience the same things seem to be like and unlike, one and many, at rest and, on the other hand, in motion," exactly fits the second part of the *Parmenides*. This part of the dialogue is composed of eight divisions¹⁵ which are meant to exhaust the consequences of the complementary propositions, the *One* is, and the *One* is not. In accordance with his previous formula¹⁶ Parmenides draws the conclusions which follow from the existence of the *One* and the non-existence of the *One*, first in respect to the *One* itself, then in respect to what is other than the *One*. But each of these four investigations falls into two contradictory sections, so that the results reached are: A—If the *One* is, then (1) The *One* is nothing, (2) The *One* is everything, (3) The others are multifarious and self-contradictory, (4) The others are nothing and the *One* is everything; B—If the *One* is not, then (1) The non-existent *One* is multifarious and self-contradictory, (2) the non-existent *One* is nothing, (3) the others are other than one another, are multifarious, and only apparent, (4) The others are nothing.¹⁷ This result is accomplished by a systematic abuse of εἶναι,¹⁸ the meaning being swung from the copulative to the existential and stress being put now on the exclusive and again on the extended meaning of the word.¹⁹ The mechanism of fallacy is precisely the same in the section I have labeled B as in A, so that we may summarily disregard all explanations of the dialogue which are

¹⁴ *Phaedrus*, 261D.

¹⁵ The passage 155E-157B is really a critique of the first two divisions. It is to be considered hereafter.

¹⁶ 135E-136A:—μη μόνον εἰ ἔστιν ἕκαστον ὑποτιθέμενον σκοπεῖν τὰ συμβαλόντα ἐκ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔστι τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὑποτιθεσθαι.

¹⁷ A1 = 137C — 142B, A2 = 142B — 155E, A3 = 157B — 159B, A4 = 159B — 160B, B1 = 160B — 163B, B2 = 163B — 164B, B3 = 164B — 165E, B4 = 165E — fin.

¹⁸ There are other sources of fallacy which appear sporadically, e. g. the juggling of ἕτερον and ἄλλον in 164B ff.

¹⁹ εἶναι in the copulative sense in A1, 4, B2, 4, in the existential sense in A2, 3, B5, 7. The results of A1 correspond to those of B2; and those of A2 to those of B1; those of A4 to those of B4; and those of A3 almost to those of B3, though in the last case it is admitted that the others only appear to have the qualities assigned to them.

based on the supposition that this section contains the key to the argument, a defense of the existence of the *One*. In like manner we are justified in rejecting Henry Jackson's notion that A2 and A3 are meant to present Plato's later theory of the Ideas.²⁰ These sections are based on the same fallacies as are B2 and B3.

Returning to the investigation of the *Sophist* we find that these paradoxes are exactly paralleled there, though in shorter compass. In the examination of *Non-Being* ²¹ B2 is paralleled by *Sophist* 237C-E and B1 by *Sophist* 238B-C, while B3 and B4 are reproduced by *Sophist* 240A-C where the Sophist defends himself by showing that if *Being* is not, *ἑδωλα* which are *other* only seem to be *other* but really are *not*. In the passage concerning *Being*, *Sophist* 244C-D parallels A1, *Sophist* 244E-245A amounts to A2, and *Sophist* 245B-D matches A3 and A4.²²

The purpose of these paradoxes in the *Sophist* is clear from Plato's own words, and the result of them is the formulation of a method of predication on the basis of the explanation of *non-Being* as differentiation. Since the *Parmenides* develops the same paradoxes in the same way, it would be reasonable to suppose that the purpose of the demonstration is the same. However, the resolution of the difficulty is not given in the *Parmenides*, which fact may lead careless readers to conclude that Plato thought such reasoning valid when he wrote that dialogue and only later, seeing the fallacies and explanations of them, wrote the *Sophist* as an answer to his previous demonstration. I cannot believe that Plato "thought with his pen" as this explanation supposes. Moreover, it has been abundantly proved that Plato knew the nature and cause of these fallacies before he wrote the *Parmenides*.²³ But, in addition, he has not failed to give a hint of the true solution in the *Parmenides* itself.

²⁰ Journal of Philology XI, page 330.

²¹ Plato treats *δν* and *ἐν* as synonyms in the Parmenidean sense. Whether the Eleatic doctrine was exactly so or not, Plato certainly took it in this sense. Cf. Theaet. 180E, Soph. 242D, and Proclus, In Parmenid. V (Cousin, p. 1032, lines 35-40) on Plato's interpretation.

²² This section of the *Sophist* shows the intimate connection of A3 with A1 and of A4 with A2 for it implies the latter conclusions simply by stressing the former, of which they are merely the reverse.

²³ Cf. Paul Shorey, *Unity of Plato's Thought*, p. 57 note.

The first two sections of that dialogue, A1 and A2, develop, on the basis of the arguments used by the Eleatics to prove the notion of *non-Being* self-contradictory, the same inconsistencies in the notion of pure *Being*; there follows a section²⁴ which maintains that on the basis of the preceding arguments it is necessary that in a sense the *One* must partake of *Being* and not partake of it, hence that the *One* will become and perish, and that this means that "when it becomes *One* it perishes as many and when it becomes many it perishes as *One*." Although this hint is not developed into the doctrine of the *Sophist*, it is obviously the same thing, and, as if to point his readers still more clearly to the clue of the trouble, in B1, while developing the consequences of the proposition, the *One* is not, he says, "So, since *Being* must have a share in *non-Being* and *non-Being* must have a share in *Being*, it is necessary for the *One*, since it is not, to have a share in *Being* in order that it may not be." In consequence of this we must be sure that the antinomies of the *Parmenides* are meant to serve the same purpose as those of the *Sophist*, i. e., to demonstrate that the hypothesis of simple *Being* leads to the same contradictions as does that of *non-Being*, that this fact should once for all be recognized in order that these childish squabbles between *Being* and *non-Being* may stop, and that Plato is well aware at the time of this dialogue what the answer to the difficulty is. To ask why he did not develop that answer is, in the phrase of Professor Shorey, to ask why he did not write the *Sophist* instead of the *Parmenides*. If we can see somewhat more clearly the artistic motive of this dialogue, we shall see why even the hints to the answer which are given are due to Plato's care in guiding his reader. Had he been less concerned for his audience, he might well have omitted these guide-posts which have been so carelessly neglected by those they were meant to aid.

In the two pages²⁵ which introduce the demonstration of *Parmenides* we find certain definite indications of the meaning which Plato desired to convey by the last part of the dialogue. The preceding debate has ended without tangible result, and *Parmenides* advises *Socrates* that a mere impulse toward philosophy will not carry him far unless, in his youth, he exercises himself in that conversation which is considered useless by most

²⁴ *Parm.*, 155E-157B.

²⁵ 135C-137C.

people. This is the process which is later demonstrated; so that we may understand it to be a necessary propaedeutic to the search for truth but not itself that search. And we must feel that the exercise has justified itself entirely if it has in the end made us more capable of meeting such paradoxes hereafter without being paralyzed by them. There follow, then, two prescriptions for this exercise; ²⁶ first, it must be an examination of abstract intelligibles and not of phenomenal objects; second, it must be an examination of the conclusions following not only from a given hypothesis but also from the opposite of that same hypothesis. Both of these prescriptions are corrections of Zeno's method, and Parmenides implies this when he gives them.²⁷ Zeno found it easy enough to set up a plurality of objects and by arguing from the existence of a plurality to show that such an hypothesis is self-contradictory; Socrates had previously objected ²⁸ to Zeno's argument that its restriction to objects of sense made it simple and not at all striking, that if a man wanted to accomplish any real feat with such arguments he should produce these paradoxes concerning abstract notions. Moreover, he had not demonstrated what conclusions would follow from the supposition that the *One* exists. This prescription, then, amounts to a criticism of the Eleatic dialectic. Plato desires to point out that the *reductio ad absurdum* of abstract notions must be carried out in the field of abstractions (i. e., that to prove by Zeno's method the absurdity of supposing material objects to be in motion is no proof at all of the absurdity of abstract motion) and that you cannot support an hypothesis by proving its opposite will lead to absurdity unless you prove also that the positive hypothesis itself will not fall into the same pit. That this applies to Zeno and his Eleatic dialectic is certain. Does Plato mean to refer it to Parmenides, too?

I have already said that the investigation of *Being* and *non-Being* in the *Sophist* begins and ends with a quotation from the poem of Parmenides and that that discussion is closed with a passage which implies that Parmenides was the father of the

²⁶ 135E-136C.

²⁷ 135D—*τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς γυμνασίας; οὗτος ὅνπερ ἤκουσας Ζήνωνος. πλὴν τοῦτό γε κτλ.*

²⁸ 129A.

sophistical method. The quotations from the poem and the references to it are so frequent in Plato's writing that we may be sure when Plato was writing the *Parmenides* he had nothing more vividly before his mind than the poem which he mentions whenever he talks of the paradoxes of *Being*. He has told us as much at the very beginning of the dialogue. As soon as Zeno has ended his reading and Socrates has summarized it, Socrates remarks to Parmenides: ²⁹ "Zeno has written the same thing as you wrote and has tried to deceive us into thinking it is something else." ³⁰ In this manner Plato reminds us that the Eleatic arguments are all of a piece and that if the flaw in one be discovered the fallacy of the whole system will have been laid bare. When Zeno says that his book was not written "with the intention of keeping people in the dark as if it were doing something great" and that it was simply the outburst of "youthful contentiousness", we cannot take these to be historical explanations of the origin of Zeno's writings. Certainly his book was taken seriously by mathematicians and physicists, ³¹ whatever the original purpose or the exact time of its composition may have been. But Plato had observed how the first taste of these paradoxes intoxicated young men, and he is here putting into Zeno's mouth words with which Socrates elsewhere reprimands such childish quibbling. ³² We may feel pretty certain, then, that Plato believed Zeno's work was considered to be important by its author and that Zeno is here made to pass on himself judgments that were Plato's and not his own.

That Parmenides and his poem are the butt at which the second part of the dialogue is aimed is put beyond doubt by the statement he makes just before beginning, ³³ when he says "Since we've decided to play a laborious game let's begin with me myself and my hypothesis." ³⁴ The second part, then, is an

²⁹ Parm., 128A-B.

³⁰ Zeno does not deny this. He corrects Socrates (128B-E) on two points, however, saying that his book has no serious and cryptic meaning and that he wrote it in his youth in a spirit of contention rather than in his prime in a spirit of ambition.

³¹ Cf. *Die Grundlagenkrise der griechischen Mathematik*, von H. Hasse und H. Scholz, S. 10 ff.; 60 f.

³² Cf. Phileb., 15D-16A.

³³ 137B.

³⁴ Plato seems to apologize for making the old man parody himself

attack on Eleaticism by the father of the school, a parody of the method used in Zeno's book, but not a parody of the form of that book. For Parmeindes has said that Zeno used only half of the necessary attack and he himself proposes to examine the positive as well as the negative proposition. We should be better able to appreciate Plato's jibe at Parmenides, if we knew whether he thought the two parts of his poem formed a unified whole or not. It seems impossible to discover that; but he was certainly aware that his readers would think of the apparent contradiction between the two parts of the poem when in his parody they read of Parmenides going on at length about *non-Being* and *plurality* just as he had really described the world of opinion which he insisted was non-existent, although he had prohibited the mere mention of "that which is not." And if Plato had given an interpretation of the poem in his usual manner of interpreting poets he would probably have said: "Parmenides far surpasses his pupil Zeno, for after he had set up the hypothesis: *Being is*, he saw the necessity for examining the results not only in respect of the existing Being, which he said was *One*, but also of the non-existing many, which he said *were not*. But he was not thorough, for he did not explain what the many would be in respect of the existing many." And it is this corrected and augmented form of Parmenides' poem which is the demonstration that forms the second part of the dialogue.

The first four sections, then (A1-4), correspond to the first part of the poem, the second four (B1-4) to the second part of it. But there is nothing in the poem corresponding to A3-4 and B1-2, and this is exactly Plato's complaint and his contribution to the solution of the paradox. Moreover, by pressing the Eleatic misuse of the copula Plato shows that the first part of Parmenides' poem presents only one-half of the possible conclusions and does not even present them fully, A1 and A2 cancel each other and the statement, the *One is*, leads to the same inconsistencies into which Zeno by the same method drove the pluralists. Worse still, to accept the conclusions we must suppose an *instantaneous*, and this only pushes us to the further

by insisting that it is an action fitting only to a private company.
Cf. 136D: εἰ μὲν οὖν πλείους ἦμεν οὐκ ἂν ἄξιον ἦν δεῖσθαι. 137A: ἐπειδὴ αὐτοὶ ἔσμεν.

extremity of saying (instead of "it exists and does not exist at the same time") "it neither exists nor does not exist."³⁵

In the sections A3 and A4, which constitute an examination of the nature of the *Others* on the assumption that the *One* exists, Plato's satire is most sharp against Parmenides. This is the very set of consequences which according to the Parmenides of the dialogue³⁶ should have been drawn in the first part of the poem if it had been correctly written, and the result of the reasoning is that the *Others* must be "one perfect whole consisting of parts" and, further, that each of these parts must "partake of the One."³⁷ Thereupon the *Unity* of the existing *One* is stressed; and now it appears that the *Others* have no qualities whatsoever. This conclusion is strictly in accord with Eleatic doctrine; too much so it appears. For immediately the sentence is added: "In that case if there is *One*, the *One* is all

³⁵ Höffding (*Bemerkungen über den Platonischen Dialog Parmenides*, Berlin, 1921), pp. 34-5, thinks that when Plato says τὸ ἐξαιφνης is "out of time" he means that it exists in the world of Ideas. But there is no question of the Ideas here. Plato is simply making Parmenides use against his own doctrine the kind of argument Zeno used against his opponents. But Plato outdoes Zeno, who made his opponents say ἡ διστὸς φερομένη ἔστηκεν (Arist. Phys. 239B 30), by making Parmenides say that according to his hypothesis the *One* οὐδὲ κινεῖτ' ἂν τότε οὐδ' ἂν σταίῃ. Plato's hint of the solution which we have discussed previously is given in the line οὐσίας μετέχειν ποτέ . . . μὴ μετέχειν αὖ ποτε οὐσίας. What follows in this discussion is a parody of Zeno, whose statement that at any given time a moving object is stationary is exactly repeated (156C) ὅταν δὲ κινούμενον τε ἴσσηται. [It seems probable that Plato in speaking of τὸ ἐξαιφνης is referring to such infinitesimal processes as that used by Antiphon to square the circle (cf. Diels Vorsok. frag. 13). Here the instant at which the inscribed and circumscribed polygons will coincide and so become a circle is 'out of time' because the process is infinite. It is the more fitting that Plato should put this bad mathematics, which his associate Eudoxus was replacing with his theory of proportions, into the mouth of Parmenides that by means of it he might characterize *Being* as neither existing nor not existing, since Antiphon himself was a follower of the Eleatics (cf. Diels frag. 1).]

³⁶ 136B: περὶ ὅτου ἀνὰ εἰ ὑποθῇ ὡς ὄντος καὶ ὡς οὐκ ὄντος . . . δεῖ σκοπεῖν τὰ συμβαίνοντα πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ πρὸς ἐν ἑκάστον τῶν ἄλλων κτλ.

³⁷ There is special sarcasm here in making Zeno's own method force the Eleatic theory to depend upon some kind of participation, the very doctrine which Zeno and Parmenides consider inconceivable when Socrates presents it as an element in his theory of Ideas. In 158A3-158B4 Parmenides asserts exactly what he argues against in 131A-D.

things (note $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ not $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$) and is not *One*. Waddell in his commentary objects "this summing-up seems rather a *non-sequitur*". It is rather a fallacy based upon the misuse of the negative proposition which is the basis of the Eleatic paradoxes and the equivocal use of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ in the singular and plural. If the demonstration is meant to be a parody, as I think it is, the reasoning is here very apt. However, Plato probably had a further reason for introducing this last, seemingly unconnected, sentence. He desires nowhere to give any countenance to the Eleatic conclusions and insists on showing that even where they seem to be partly justified if they be steadily pursued they will suddenly turn out to be the very opposite to what they seem. Here Parmenides in the course of proving his favorite thesis, the emptiness of the *Others*, tumbles into the startling conclusion that the *One* is not *One* but *Many*.

The last four sections, interpreted as a parody of the second half of the poem, take on meaning where they had none before. Parmenides is made to do exactly what he continually claimed was impossible, examine the nature of the non-existent. As in the *Sophist* Plato makes the Stranger call special attention to his disobedience of Parmenides' injunction by quoting the poem, he here makes the poet disobey himself at dizzy length. However Plato may have interpreted the second part of the poem, it doubtlessly amused him to see so much time spent on the detailed description of objects which the poet insisted all the while do not exist. In B3 and B4 Plato has hinted, however, at a correction of Parmenides' attitude to the non-existing *Others*. Since he had said that they do not exist and then had proceeded to describe them, he doubtlessly meant that they seem to exist although they do not. In the last two sections of the dialogue this is the conclusion, the *Others seem* to be many, the *Others are* nothing. But this conclusion is reached from the assumption that the *One* is not. In other words, it seems that Plato means to say: "Parmenides mistakenly came to the right conclusion concerning the *Others* by proceeding from the wrong premises." We cannot, of course, be sure that he thought this was the meaning Parmenides gave to the second part of his poem any more than we can say that Plato really believed the poem of Simonides meant what Socrates in the *Protagoras* says it

meant; but this is the interpretation he obviously chooses to present for his purpose here.³⁸

As in B3 and B4 Plato shows that the conclusions of Parmenides concerning the *Others* follow rather from the non-existence of the *One* than from its existence, so in B1 and B2 he shows that the characteristics attaching to *One* if it does not exist are exactly the same as those which it has if it does exist. It is worth noting that of the eight conclusions drawn in the eight sections only the last two could in any way be acceptable to the Eleatics and they presuppose the proposition that the *One* is not. The others, however closely the argument promises to draw to Parmenides, all turn out as stark denials of his thesis.

But without a detailed examination of this demonstration of Parmenides, can anyone who reads the final sentence doubt that Plato meant to parody at one stroke the poem of Parmenides and the dialectical method of Zeno? "Let it be pronounced that, whether *One* exists or does not exist, it itself and those that are other than it, in relation to themselves and to one another are and are not all things in all ways and appear to be and do not appear to be." And even if Plato had not meant it, could any Athenian have missed the tragic sarcasm, could any Greek have read that sentence without a reminiscent smile at the sublimity of Parmenides and the cleverness of Zeno?

Höfding,³⁹ much against his will, saw that the second part of the dialogue was a criticism of the Eleatics; but he seems to have believed that it was inadvertently so. He says: "Allererst muss gesagt werden, dass das Thema für die Anwendung der neuen Methode nicht glücklich gewählt war. Es war ja doch der Platonismus, nicht der Eleatismus der untersucht werden sollte." We may, I think, proceed on the presumption that whether in the end Plato succeeded or failed he always was well aware of his purpose. So, seeing that the second part is an attack on the Eleatics, we should seek to discover why Plato attacked them and not take refuge in the subterfuge that he did

³⁸ A3 and A4 bear this out. They cannot be meant to represent the second part of the poem, for the conclusions reached from them are that the *Others* are everything and the *Others* are nothing. They do, however, provide the companion-piece to the criticism of B3 and B4 since they say in substance, the *Others* are everything and nothing on the premise that the *One* is.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 25-6.

so without knowing it. Höffding's misconception arises from two common mistakes. He believes that the subject of the demonstration is the concept of *Unity* instead of which Plato should have chosen to discuss the concept of *Identity*, and he thinks the demonstration should be a direct defense of the theory of Ideas which has been discussed in the first part of the dialogue. We have already seen that in the parallel investigation of the *Sophist* the problem is that aroused by the concepts of *Being* and *non-Being* and concerns *Unity* only in the specific Eleatic identification of *Unity* and *Being*. In the *Parmenides*, too, the antinomies rest upon the abuse of the verb 'to be', and the *One* is chosen for the demonstration only because it was the favorite thesis of Parmenides. The *One* here is practically synonymous with *Being*, and the whole implication of the introduction to the second part of the dialogue is that the same kind of results can be reached no matter what the subject of the discussion may be, if only you use the method which Parmenides is about to apply. Höffding believes that the concept of *Identity* should have been investigated because he feels that by so doing Plato might have answered the objections to the Ideas brought by Parmenides in the first part of the dialogue. We must, then, decide what the character of this part really is, and what is its relationship to the latter part. The occasion of the entire discussion is the reading of Zeno's book, and Plato could not have more clearly entitled the dialogue a discussion of the Eleatic method. Socrates introduces his theory of Ideas only as a possible explanation of the apparent paradoxes into which Zeno has been driving his pluralistic adversaries; and the attack upon Socrates' suggestion is really an attempt on the part of Parmenides to defend the validity of his pupil's reasoning. Of these objections, the first⁴⁰ is a quibble made plausible by shifting from Socrates' analogy of "the all-pervading day" to the essentially different analogy of a sail-cloth; and at the bottom of the objection lies the thesis that *Being* is indivisible. This argument is developed abstractly⁴¹ by the tacit predication of material qualities to abstract Ideas (e. g., any *part* of the *Idea* of equality would be *smaller* than the *Idea* itself and yet, by the theory, the object which has this part smaller than equality will thereby be rendered equal to something). The Ideas are, then, said to be open

⁴⁰ 131A-C.

⁴¹ 131D-E.

to the objection of an infinite regress,⁴² an objection which depends upon debasing the Idea to the level of material objects and is due primarily to a juggling of the verb "to be". It amounts to saying that the statement "Smallness is smallness" is equivalent to the judgment "An Idea exists which has the predicate small."⁴³

The same objection of an infinite regression is brought against the device of "imitation of the Ideas by objects", and it is based upon the same fallacious degradation of the Ideas to the level of phenomena.⁴⁴ Upon this follows a dissertation of the impossibility of any communion between the world of Ideas and that of Phenomena. This difficulty Plato always recognized and the complete solution of it has never been found. But we should notice the aptness of its introduction here. It was a doctrine dear to the Eleatics that "Being is not more or less";⁴⁵ if, then, the Idea truly is, the phenomenal world cannot exist even as a "less real imitation" of the Ideas or as an "approximation" to them. Nor, if the phenomenal world is not, can there be any relationship between *Being* and *non-Being*. With this is linked the objection that intercommunion of Ideas still remains communion only in the world of Ideas and cannot have any connection with the phenomenal world. Here we may remember with profit that in the *Sophist* the doctrine of the communion of Ideas was set forth in conjunction with the theory of the complementary existence of *Being* and *non-Being* as a defiant answer to Parmenides. Obviously Plato felt that the two prob-

⁴² 132A-B.

⁴³ This danger of the infinite regress is warded off in Republic 597C by saying "There is only *One* Idea of each class." There the essential difference between Ideas and material objects is explained by saying that God made the former. Elsewhere the difference is stated abstractly in the terminology used for defining the Ideas. They are (Tim. 48E) νοητὸν καὶ αἰὲ κατὰ ταῦτ' ὄν, (Symp. 211A) αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ μεθ' αὐτοῦ μορφοειδὲς αἰὲ ὄν. The ordinary epithet of an Idea αὐτὸ ὃ ἔστι (cf. e.g., Phaedo 75C) is used just for the purpose of forestalling the kind of fallacy Parmenides introduces; it says in effect that the "quality" of an Idea is the Idea itself, its subject, and not a characteristic of it, its predicate.

⁴⁴ 132D-133A. For a discussion of the fallacy in this argument, cf. A. E. Taylor's paper in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* XVI N. S.

⁴⁵ Parmenides fragment VIII, lines 47-48 (Diels F. d. V.).

lems were connected and that both objections rested upon ignorance of the true nature of predication.⁴⁶ He constantly refers to the difficulty of bridging the chasm between the two worlds, but he is inclined to lay the fault to the inherent weakness of the human mind.⁴⁷ By firm faith, a knowledge of the true dialectic, and long practice he felt that man could finally cross over from the world of appearance to the world of truth.⁴⁸

There remains one more passage in the first part to examine. After Parmenides has argued against the possibility of participation, Socrates suggests that perhaps the Ideas are simply thoughts in souls.⁴⁹ Of this short shrift is made. Either everything will consist of thoughts and so will think, or, though everything is a thought, it is thoughtless. Socrates at once abandons the modified theory as unreasonable. Now this is the only place in all his writings that Plato suggests the theory which has come to be called in modern times *Idealism*, and he proposes and rejects it in twenty lines. It is obvious from this passage as well as others that he never held a theory of Ideas in the idealistic sense. Why then does he have Socrates propose such an interpretation here? It is possible that there were philosophers living at the time when Plato wrote this dialogue who did teach some such idealism; but we have no knowledge of them, and it is noteworthy that Plato does not elsewhere refer to them or their doctrine. It is more plausible to say that this is the kind of interpretation which might be given by a young man, by a student in the Academy for example, when he was being harassed with the difficulties of hypostatized Ideas. Certainly Plato here insists that when he speaks of Ideas he means them to be understood as having separate and real existence. But, I think, there is a further reason for introducing the matter at this point. The theory of Ideas as developed here into idealism would remind the reader of a hard saying of Parmenides himself: τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι.⁵⁰ Whatsoever is the true meaning of that sentence, Plato would cer-

⁴⁶ That Plato took the foundation of these objections to be the paradox of "the one and the many" he expressly says in *Philebus* 15B-C.

⁴⁷ *Charmid.* 169A, *Phileb.* 15D.

⁴⁸ *Phileb.* 16C-17A, *Sympos.* 211C, and *Parmenides* 135B-C.

⁴⁹ 132B-C.

⁵⁰ *Parmenides* frag. V (Diels F. d. V.).

tainly feel that it was the outcome of that treacherous manipulation of the copulative verb; he does not want such meanings read into his doctrine; and in this passage Socrates is warned—and with true Platonic humor by Parmenides himself—that, if he should attempt such an escape from his difficulties, he would fall into the false doctrine of the Eleatics who confuse *Being* and *Thinking*.

The first part of the dialogue then serves as an example of the way in which the Eleatics meet the answers to the paradoxes with which they defend their doctrines. Parmenides has used against Socrates arguments based on the same equivocation as are the paradoxes of Zeno's book. Instead of quoting that book which his readers might examine if they would, Plato gives an example of the same technique used against his own doctrine and uses this as the occasion for the second part, a complete parody of the Eleatic method. It is strange that the demonstration of Parmenides should ever have been taken as a serious example of Platonic dialectic. It is at best only the first step in Plato's method as the *Sophist* amply proves, for when an hypothesis is found to lead you to two inconsistent conclusions, you must examine and correct the hypothesis as Plato does in that dialogue.

Why Plato does not stop to demonstrate the fallacy in Parmenides' objections now becomes clear. He means to make these objections look as plausible as possible and then to cut the ground from under him, not by a formal rebuttal but with a demonstration of the manner in which, by the equivocal use of the verb "to be", any hypothesis—even the hypothesis of Parmenides himself—can be made to result in exactly opposite conclusions. The second part of the dialogue, for the reason that it is a parody of the Eleatic method applied to the doctrine of Parmenides—and by Parmenides himself—, is a complete answer to the objections raised in the first part. Besides, it is a horrible example set up to warn all those who are tempted to indulge in the legerdemain of *Being* and *non-Being*. The *Sophist* gives a succinct and serious analysis of this sleight-of-hand and the answer to its mystical magic; the *Parmenides* is content to set the intelligent thinking that it is not safe to use the two-edged sword of paradox in the search for truth.

HAROLD FREDRIK CHERNISS.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

THE *DIRITAS* OF TIBERIUS

[An investigation of the remarks ascribed to Tiberius confirms the charge of *diritas* brought against him by Augustus, Tacitus and others. His harsh remarks are almost always made under provocation, but they are still tactless and cruel and readily explain the unpopularity of the emperor. This *diritas* seems to have been characteristic of him before his accession and throughout his reign.]

History has presented the emperor Tiberius to us in the guise of a misanthrope. It is true that his affection for his first wife, from whom he was cruelly separated for reasons of state, and his fond devotion to his brother Drusus¹ are bright flashes in the dismal life of Tiberius Claudius Nero, but such illumination is most conspicuous for its rarity. His step-father, Augustus, expressed his disapproval of the "harshness, bitterness, and intolerance" of Tiberius' ways;² Theodore of Gadara referred to Tiberius as "mud kneaded with blood,"³ while his enemies depicted him as a monster of cruelty.

Let us see whether this picture of the misanthrope will be justified by a study of the remarks made by Tiberius in his dealings with his fellow-men. Time has spared for us a really surprising number of sayings of the emperor which furnish material for our investigation.

The relations between Tiberius and his family were fraught with many unpleasantnesses.⁴ In spite of some charming letters of solicitude and praise addressed by Augustus to his step-son,⁵ we find that Augustus still had doubts about Tiberius' character. In view of his strictures mentioned above and his letters condemning Tiberius, which Livia treasured and revealed in a fit of rage long after her husband's death,⁶ it is possible to consider as genuine the alleged remark of Augustus on his deathbed. It was commonly believed that the dying emperor, after a long

¹ G. P. Baker, *Tiberius Caesar*, 1929, p. 62; though Tiberius may have sometimes disagreed with Drusus I believe, as Baker does, that Tiberius loved his younger brother.

² Suet., *Tib.*, XXI, 2 and LI.

³ *Ibid.*, LVII; Dio, LVIII, frg. Const. Man., V, 1974.

⁴ Suet., *Tib.*, LI: Mention is made of his *odium in necessitudines*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XXI, 4-7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, LI, 1.

conference with his son and heir, was overheard by his chamberlains to remark when Tiberius left the room, "Unhappy people of Rome, who will come under jaws that move so slowly."⁷ In this connection Suetonius adds, "Not even of this fact am I unaware, namely that some people have reported that Augustus openly and without dissimulation disapproved so much of the harshness (*diritatem*) of Tiberius' manners that he sometimes cut short his freer and more joyous conversation at the appearance of Tiberius."⁸

Perhaps this *diritas* went far towards antagonizing Tiberius' relatives. It must surely have played a part in the emperor's relations with Agrippina, if we may judge from the following anecdote in Suetonius: "When Agrippina, his daughter-in-law, was complaining about something too freely after the death of her husband, Tiberius took her by the hand and quoted the Greek verse, 'If you be not empress, little daughter, do you think that you are being injured?'"⁹ Doubtless, the haughty, spirited Agrippina had vexed Tiberius excessively, but his remark, ironical as it was, can have inspired nothing but hatred in the woman's violent and imperious soul.

History says that Tiberius frequently admonished (*frequenter admonuit*) Livia "to abstain from too great matters which did not become a woman;"¹⁰ and we know that from the time of his accession he refused to sanction the immoderate honors voted her and did not permit her any extravagance of conduct. The freedom accorded her by Augustus (*sicut sub marito solita esset*)¹¹ must have increased her resentment of Tiberius' frequent rebukes, so their relations grew increasingly strained until Livia was finally removed from taking part in state affairs, and it was perhaps chiefly on her account that Tiberius withdrew to Capreae.¹²

⁷ *Ibid.*, XXI, 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, LIII: "Si non dominaris," inquit, "filiola, iniuriam te accipere existimas?"; Tac., *Ann.*, IV, 52: audita haec raram occulti pectoris vocem elicere, correptamque Graeco versu admonuit non ideo laedi quia non regnaret. This incident falls in the year 26 A. D.

¹⁰ Suet., *Tib.*, L, 3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² See Dio, LVII, 12; Suetonius, *Tib.*, LI-LII.

One of the keenest disappointments of the emperor was, doubtless, his own son, Drusus, about whom Dio writes as follows: "He [Tiberius] became angry with his son Drusus who was both very licentious and very cruel, so that the sharpest swords are called Drusian from him, and he reproved him often both in private and in public. And on one occasion he said to him in the presence of many people, 'As long as I am alive, you shall do nothing violent or haughty, and if you even dare anything, not when I am dead either.'" ¹³ The sternness of the remark, well deserved as it doubtless was, indicates a complete alienation of affection between the two, and the emperor's words could not have improved the situation.

Tiberius' wife, Julia, was treated with the utmost severity by her husband after he came to the throne, if we may trust our sources. ¹⁴ She had not been a faithful wife, and the emperor Tiberius can have had little but bitterness and dislike in his soul for the infamous Julia.

Two other members of the imperial family, both in time emperors, met with irritating rebukes from Tiberius. One of these was Gaius Caligula. Tiberius once said that "Gaius was living to be the destruction of himself and of all, and that he [Tiberius] was rearing a viper for the Roman people and a Phaethon for the world." ¹⁵ Nor did he refrain from insult or ridicule to Gaius' face, for in the course of a chance conversation, when Caligula was making fun of Lucius Sulla, Tiberius prophesied that Caligula "would have all of Sulla's vices and not one of his virtues; ¹⁶ at the same time, as he was weeping and embracing the younger of his grandsons, he noted the cruel glance of Caligula and said, 'You will kill him, and someone else will kill you.'" ¹⁷

The future emperor Claudius met with an amusing though

¹³ LVII, 13, 1-2. Dio gives this remark in his treatment of the year 14 A. D., but the words may have been spoken at a later date.

¹⁴ Suet., *Tib.*, L, 1. At the time of her banishment, however, Tiberius is said to have tried to reconcile Augustus to Julia.

¹⁵ *Id.*, *Cal.*, XI.

¹⁶ Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 46: omnia Sullae vitia et nullam eiusdem virtutem habiturum praedixit. These words are probably to be assigned to 37 A. D., the year under which Tacitus gives them.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: "Occides hunc tu," inquit, "et te alius." This, of course, may well have been a story which was circulated after the event.

unpleasant rebuke at the hands of his paternal uncle, when, not satisfied with the *consularia ornamenta*, he wrote urgently demanding the actual magistracy. Tiberius' only reply was a note to the effect that he "had sent him forty gold pieces for the holidays of the Saturnalia and Sigillaria."¹⁸ Such an answer to an urgent request for the consulship was putting Claudius in his place with a vengeance. Claudius' rôle was to play "mora" or shake the dice, but he could not hold the consulship.

Thus we see Tiberius estranged from most of his family, and in his remarks there is a spirit which he was doubtless entitled to feel in all the cases, but the expression of which must have added fuel to the flames of mistrust and dislike for Tiberius that smouldered in the breasts of Agrippina, Drusus, Gaius, and Claudius.

Officials and people of importance received their share of pungent comments which were not without a shade of harshness. So when Aemilius Rectus, prefect of Egypt from about 1 to 17 A. D., sent Tiberius more money than he had stipulated, the emperor replied that he wanted his sheep "shorn and not shaven."¹⁹ Very likely the rescript was in the normal curt style of the emperor, consisting probably of the one sentence. The rebuke might well antagonize the prefect, though we cannot but sympathize with Tiberius and the unfortunate taxpayers of Egypt. This affair may possibly belong to the year 14 A. D., where it is given by Dio.

Tiberius, who himself accumulated a vast fortune estimated at two billion seven hundred million sesterces,²⁰ had, as we know from the *Annales* of Tacitus, little sympathy for spend-thrifts.²¹ When, therefore, a certain Acilius Buta of praetorian

¹⁸ Suet., *Claudius*, V: . . . id solum codicillis rescripsit, quadraginta aureos in Saturnalia et Sigillaria misisse ei.

¹⁹ Dio, LVII, 10, 5; Suet., *Tib.*, XXXI writes: Praesidibus onerandas tributo provincias suadentibus rescripsit boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere; Dio, LVI, 16, 3 says that Bato gave the following reason to Tiberius for his revolt from Rome: "You Romans are to blame for this; for you send us as guardians of your flocks, not dogs or shepherds, but wolves."

²⁰ Suet., *Caligula*, XXXVII.

²¹ II, 48: Ceterum ut honestam innocentium paupertatem levavit, ita prodigos et ob flagitia egentes . . . movit senatu aut sponte cedere passus est.

rank confessed to Tiberius (doubtless with the expectation that the emperor would replenish his funds) that his vast inheritance had been consumed, Tiberius dryly remarked, "You have been late in waking up."²²

A similar rebuff was promptly administered at the beginning of his reign when a certain man said to Tiberius, "You remember——". Then, before the fellow could parade further indications of former familiarity, Tiberius broke in with the words, "I don't remember what I was." One is forced to add, as Seneca does after recounting this incident: "Ab hoc quidni non esset repetendum beneficium?"²³

Flattery was, as a rule, offensive to Tiberius and provoked sarcasm, irony, or harsh rebuke. In 32 A. D. a certain senator, Tongonius Gallus, a man of no distinction, tried to gain a hearing in the senate by asking Tiberius to select senators from whose number twenty, drawn by lot and armed with swords, should defend him as often as he should enter the senate. Then Tiberius, who was accustomed to mingle jest with serious matters (*ludibria seriis permiscere solitus*), gave thanks for the kindness of the fathers; "But who could be passed over, who could be chosen? Would they always be the same or should they serve in turn? Should they be those senators who had run the *cursus honorum* or young men, men in private life, or men in office? What, then, would be the appearance of these men taking up swords on the threshold of the senate-house? His life would not be of such value to him if it had to be protected by arms. Such were his moderate jests against Tongonius; they suggested nothing beyond the quashing of the motion."²⁴ The mocking tone of the remarks is apparent, and it must have left Tongonius abashed and resentful.

Divine honors apparently were distasteful to Tiberius, and he generally seems to have treated those who proffered them with a certain reticence which was little short of cruel²⁵ and which

²² Seneca, *Epistulae ad Lucilium*, 122, 10: "Sero," inquit, "expectatus es." Perhaps this remark may be assigned to 16 A. D., when the similar case of Hortalus was discussed in the senate, or to the following year when several profligate senators were expelled from the order.

²³ *Id.*, *De Beneficiis*, V, 25.

²⁴ Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 2.

²⁵ Cf. Rostovtzeff, "L'Empereur Tibère et le Culte Impérial," *Revue Historique*, CLXIII (1930), p. 23.

must have left his subjects both puzzled and angry. So when the senate, probably in 14 or 15 A. D.,²⁶ urged Tiberius to permit his birth month, November, to be "Tiberius", he made the cutting reply, "What will you do, then, if there be thirteen Caesars?"²⁷ The proposal was dropped forthwith, but its sponsors cannot have been pleased with its reception.

Three flatterers were publicly rebuked by Tiberius with an insistence on form and an evident severity of tone: When he was called "Lord" (*dominus*) by a certain man, Tiberius forbade him to address him further "insultingly". When another man spoke of Tiberius' activities as "sacred," Tiberius compelled him to change "sacred" to "laborious;" and again when another man said that he had come before the senate on Tiberius' "authority", he was forced to change "authority" to "advice."²⁸ The sharp rebuffs administered publicly by the emperor seem unnecessarily humiliating to the flatterers, though the men certainly deserved rebuke for overstepping the limits laid down by Tiberius in such matters, limits which were in general those that Augustus had prescribed for himself²⁹ though still more confined in Tiberius' case, as I believe.

In spite of Suetonius' characterization of Tiberius' conversation in the senate as "percivilis,"³⁰ the emperor did not refrain from sarcasm, probably the most offensive form of rebuke: so when in 32 A. D. Junius Gallio moved that members of the praetorian guards who had finished their term of service should have the privilege of sitting in the fourteen rows reserved in the theatre for the *equites*, Tiberius wrote a violent rebuke "asking just as if he were present, 'what business Gallio had with the soldiers for whom it was right to receive neither commands nor rewards from anyone except the emperor; *he had certainly discovered what had escaped the foresight of the deified*

²⁶ See the discussion of the date in my "Greek and Roman Honorific Months," *Yale Classical Studies* II (1931), p. 229.

²⁷ Dio, LVII, 18, 2.

²⁸ Suet., *Tib.*, XXVII; Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 87: *acerbeque increpuit eos, qui divinas occupationes ipsumque dominum dixerant*. These cases probably came between 14 and 19 A. D.; Tacitus mentions them in his treatment of 19 A. D.

²⁹ L. R. Taylor, "Tiberius' Refusals of Divine Honors," *T. A. P. A.*, LX (1922), pp. 87-101.

³⁰ *Tib.*, XIX.

Augustus. Or perhaps this was discord and revolt devised by a follower of Sejanus, by which he might under the pretence of honor incite the untutored mind to the overthrow of military discipline.'"³¹

In the same sarcastic vein is Tiberius' remark uttered under the following circumstances. He had been spending some time in Campania, and in 21 A. D. Cornelius Dolabella moved that Tiberius enter Rome in an ovation. In reply the emperor wrote of his conquests and his celebration or refusal of so many triumphs in his youth. He asked if now in his old age he should be coveting "an empty distinction for undertaking a suburban promenade (*inane praemium peregrinationis suburbanae*)."³²

An example of extreme cruelty, if we may trust our sources, is that of Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus in 34 A. D. "Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus," writes Dio, "who had never governed a province or accepted bribes, was convicted because of a tragedy he had composed, and fell a victim to a worse fate than that which he had described. *Atreus* was the name of his drama, and, in the manner of Euripides, it advised one of the subjects of that monarch to endure the folly of the reigning prince. Tiberius, upon hearing of it, declared that this had been written with reference to himself, claiming that he himself was *Atreus* because of his blood-thirstiness, and remarking, 'I will make him Ajax,' he compelled him to commit suicide."³³ The accusations of adultery with Livilla and the practice of magic doubtless acted in conjunction with the alleged veiled reference to Tiberius in the play. The emperor's comment is, however, as malevolent as the prosecution of the unfortunate Scaurus was merciless.

A similar savagery is found in the reported remarks of Tiberius to or about enemies. When an enemy, probably political, named Carnulus, was reported to have taken his own life before he could be punished, Tiberius is said to have ex-

³¹ Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 3: The unfortunate Gallio was expelled from the senate, banished to Lesbos, and finally brought back to confinement in a magistrate's home in Rome, because it was thought that Lesbos was too attractive a place of banishment.

³² *Ibid.*, III, 47, 4.

³³ LVIII, 24, 3-4; Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 29.

claimed: "Carnulus has escaped me."³⁴ On another occasion Tiberius inspected the prisoners. When one of the condemned asked for a speedy infliction of the penalty, Tiberius replied, "I have not yet made my peace with you."³⁵

Two instances of punning by Tiberius have been recorded, and in both there is brutality, provided, of course, that the anecdotes are authentic. A Roman knight, Pompeius by name, stubbornly kept making some denial. Tiberius threatened him with imprisonment and said that from Pompeius the man would become "Pompeianus", "cruelly punning," as Suetonius says, "at the same time on the name of the man and the former misfortune of the Pompeian party."³⁶

At another time, it happened that a corpse was being carried through the forum on its way to burial. A buffoon ran up to the bier and pretended to whisper in the ear of the corpse; when the bystanders asked what he had said, he replied that he had told the dead man to tell Augustus that the people had not yet received the legacies left them. Tiberius had the fellow brought to him and commanded that he get what was due him (*debitum*) and be led off to execution, adding by way of jest that he should himself tell the truth to his [Tiberius'] father.³⁷

We have seen above what an ungracious remark Tiberius had made to the senators who were desirous of calling his birth month "Tiberius". This incident, as well as others, indicates a tendency to treat envoys and magistrates in groups in the same sneering manner with which individuals were so often handled.

Augustus had once received a solemn embassy from Tarragona in Spain which had come to inform him that a palm tree had miraculously sprung up on his altar there; Augustus had overwhelmed the ambassadors by the remark: "That shows how often you burn incense to me." It was in much the same ironical way that Tiberius received the envoys from Illium, who

³⁴ Suet., *Tib.*, LXI, 5: "Carnulus me evasit."

³⁵ *Ibid.*: Dio, LVIII, 3, 6. This remark is given by Dio under the year 30 A. D.

³⁶ *Tib.*, LVII.

³⁷ Dio, LVII, 14, 1-2 and Suet., *Tib.*, LVII, where we see the pun intended in the double meaning of *debitum*. I am at a loss to know whether we are to accept this tale as it stands. It hardly seems that Tiberius would have had the man executed, especially in the earlier part of his reign (Dio seems to assign the episode to the year 15 A. D.).

somewhat tardily (either in 23 or 24 A. D.) came to offer their condolences on the death of his son Drusus. Tiberius replied that "he too offered his sympathy for their misfortune in losing their distinguished townsman Hector."³⁸

The people of Rhodes evidently felt that they could treat the former exile somewhat cavalierly. At any rate in 14 A. D., shortly after the death of Augustus, the magistrates of the island sent to Tiberius a document without the proper subscription. The magistrates were at once summoned, and doubtless made the journey to Rome in fear and trembling, only to be dismissed with the laconic injunction: "Subscribe."³⁹

Sometimes humble people met with a treatment that displayed various degrees of severity. When Tiberius was in Rhodes, he had gone to hear at an unusual time Diogenes, a *grammaticus*, who was accustomed to lecture only on Saturdays. Diogenes sent his slave boy to tell the future emperor to come back after seven days. Years later, perhaps shortly after Tiberius came to the throne, when Diogenes came to Rome and stood at the emperor's door to pay his respects, Tiberius dismissed him with a direction to return after seven years.⁴⁰ This was paying off Diogenes in his own coin, and with interest, but under the circumstances, the words, though most amusing, were unkind, coming from one so exalted to one so humble.

One of the most unjust pleasantries of the emperor, if the tale is true, is the treatment accorded a fisherman who unexpectedly broke in upon Tiberius' privacy at Capri and offered him a huge mullet. The ruler was terrified because the fisherman had come upon him from the rear, after clambering up the rough, pathless section of the island. He ordered his attendants to scour the countenance of the unfortunate fellow with the very fish he had brought as a present. The fisherman, as he was undergoing his punishment, congratulated himself on not having offered the emperor an exceedingly large lobster which he had also caught. Tiberius overheard the words, and,

³⁸ Suet., *Tib.*, LII, 2.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, XXXII: ne verbo quidem insectatus ac tantum modo iussos subscribere remisit; Dio, LVII, 11, 2.

⁴⁰ Suet., *Tib.*, XXXII: nihil amplius quam ut post septimum annum rediret admonuit.

with a brutal display of ill-humor, ordered the fisherman's face to be torn with the lobster too.⁴¹

It is significant that Tiberius' remarks, so often ridiculing the shortcomings of mankind, are material for the fabulist. So Phaedrus tells how a steward, by a show of industry in watering the dusty soil at the villa at Misenum, once the property of Lucullus, tried to gain Tiberius' notice, and with it some reward. The emperor noticed the steward, summoned him, and spoke thus to the delighted slave who came up smiling and certain of reward: "You have not accomplished much and your work is spent in vain; with me freedom is much more dearly purchased."⁴²

However true the tale may be, the story of Tiberius and the alleged inventor of malleable glass at least indicates the popular conception of Tiberius' ruthless nature. When the craftsman had demonstrated the properties of his invention and answered in the affirmative Tiberius' question as to whether he was the sole possessor of the secret, the emperor immediately had him executed, according to Petronius, "that glass might not become cheap as dirt."⁴³

It is only rarely in the recorded remarks of Tiberius that we find a flash of wit untinged with harshness, as in the case of Tiberius' comment on Surrentine wine which was highly favored for its lightness and healthfulness: "Doctors," said the emperor, "have laid their heads together to give Surrentine a testimonial—and I must say it's excellent vinegar."⁴⁴ There was, moreover, authority in this witty pronouncement from the lips of such a connoisseur as "Biberius Caldus Mero."⁴⁵

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, LX. The affair may have taken place between 27-37 A. D., the period when Tiberius was at Capri.

⁴² *Fabulae* II, 5: "Tum sic iocata est tanti maiestas ducis: 'Non multum egisti et opera nequiquam perit; multo maioris alapae mecum veneunt.'" Tiberius had stopped at the villa on a trip to Naples; the date cannot be determined.

⁴³ *Satyricon*, 51; Pliny, *N. H.*, 36, 195; Dio, 57, 21. From Dio's account the execution of the craftsman would appear to come after 23 A. D.

⁴⁴ Pliny, *N. H.*, XIV, 64. I have given the translation of J. Wright Duff in his *Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age* (1927), p. 380.

⁴⁵ Suet., *Tib.*, XLII, 1. Equally good-natured seems to be the comment he made on Curtius Rufus, a man of low origin, when he recommended him for the praetorship: "Curtius Rufus seems to me to have been his own father" (Tac., *Ann.*, XI, 21, 3).

The emperor who likened his rule over Rome to holding a wolf by the ears,⁴⁶ could occasionally display his shrewd judgment of his subjects with genuine good humor, as when he sent to the market to be offered for sale a mullet which had been sent to him, saying to his friends, "I'll eat my hat if that mullet isn't bought by Apicius or Publius Octavius,"⁴⁷ and Octavius promptly bought the fish for half a million.

Such good nature is exceptional, and Tiberius' experiences with his fellow-men and his unusually keen insight into their deceptive ways filled him with bitterness. The hollowness of the flattery with which he was treated by the senate is said to have wrung from his lips as often as he left the senate-house these words in Greek: "O men ripe for slavery."⁴⁸ The blackness of his misanthropy is illustrated by the frequent repetition of the phrase: "When I am dead, let earth be mingled with fire."⁴⁹ Born of the same despair and disillusionment is the cry of Tiberius, oft repeated, that "Priam was happy because he had survived all his people."⁵⁰ Then toward the end, in 37 A. D., there is a note of reproachful sadness in the words of the aged emperor, when he perceived that Macro, his praetorian prefect, was courting the favor of Caligula: "You do well, indeed," he said, "to abandon the setting and hasten to the rising sun."⁵¹

The sting of Tiberius' remarks may conceivably have been intensified by his great deliberation of speech, accompanied by a supple movement of his fingers, mannerisms which Suetonius characterizes as disagreeable and signs of arrogance.⁵² This arrogance of the emperor whose haughty rule of conduct was "Let them hate me, provided they approve what I do"⁵³ is typical of the Claudian family.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, XXV.

⁴⁷ Seneca, *Epist. ad Lucilium*, 95. Tiberius was evidently at Rome when presented with the mullet.

⁴⁸ Tacitus, *Ann.*, III, 65: "O homines ad servitutem paratos!"

⁴⁹ Dio, LVIII, 23, 4: ἐμοῦ θανάτος γαῖα μυχθήτω πυρ.

⁵⁰ Suet., *Tib.*, LXII, 31. Cf. Dio, LVIII, 23, 4: "Often, also, he used to declare Priam fortunate because he had involved his country and his throne in his utter ruin."

⁵¹ Tacitus, *Ann.*, VI, 46.

⁵² *Tib.*, LXVIII, 3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, LIX, 1, 1.

An attempt has been made not to study the many-sided character of Tiberius, but rather to offer a contribution to our knowledge of one side of it. The evidence here adduced can be fairly well dated and it seems to indicate that the asperity of the emperor's language underwent no material change during his reign. The stories of the treatment accorded the inventor of malleable glass and the buffoon are probably inventions, since neither are mentioned by Tacitus, who could scarcely have failed to use them, if true, for his characterization of Tiberius. Furthermore, we know nothing of the circumstances relating to the prosecution of Carnulus or the prisoner who begged for a speedy infliction of the penalty, and knowledge of the circumstances might well extenuate or excuse Tiberius' remarks in connection with both cases. The one case of apparently unjustified brutality is that of the fisherman, but, if it is true, one can understand how the secret penetration of the ruler's retreat was in itself an offense, and moreover, how one so exposed to plots as Tiberius might be quick to suspect a trick.

It may be here remarked that much light will be thrown on the character of Tiberius by two studies already completed but not yet published.⁵⁴ One is concerned with "Criminal Trials and Legislation under Tiberius" and the other with "Der Prozess des Cotta Messallinus"; both will, I believe, give a fair and unprejudiced view of certain phases of Tiberius' character, while the latter shows that evidence which has been taken as an indication of alleged mental deterioration or madness in the emperor's last years has been falsely interpreted. One may, of course, readily believe that in the last years of his reign Tiberius was more disillusioned and embittered than ever, but such a state of mind is not madness.

This investigation has not attacked the problem of his attitude towards freedom of speech and constitutional government, but has tried rather to evaluate, in the light of his remarks to individuals, the judgment passed upon his "harshness, bitterness, and intolerance" by Augustus, Tacitus, and others. His very words convict him of these particular faults, but his cynicism, sarcasm, and brutal frankness should not prejudice our judg-

⁵⁴ The writer, Professor R. S. Rogers, has kindly permitted me to read both in manuscript.

ment of his accomplishments as a general, legislator, executive, and financier. It is only fair to point out that often the victims of Tiberius' remarks were not undeserving of rebuke; extortionate governors, spendthrift nobles, fawning or contentious senators, disrespectful, impudent subjects, and ambitious, cruel, or incompetent relatives frequently deserved what they received in the way of reproach. Still, however justified Tiberius' words sometimes were, they were often of such a nature as to antagonize those against whom they were directed, and a ruler who would make them could never be expected to win popular favor.

KENNETH SCOTT.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY.

SOME POLITICAL ALLUSIONS IN PLAUTUS'
TRINUMMUS.

Ever since Ritschl discussed the date of the *Trinummus*—in his *Parerga*, 339 ff.—it has been known that the play was produced at the Megalensian games and that the play therefore belongs after 194 B. C. Furthermore, it has been noticed that the frequent references to Eastern affairs suggest a date after the return of the Scipios from Magnesia. In this note I wish to point out what seem to me some rather definite allusions to the events of about 187 B. C.

It will be remembered that men of the Catonian party began a systematic attack upon the aristocratic clique associated with the Scipios about 190 B. C. In that year Cato brought public action against Thermus and Acilius Glabrio; then, after the return of Manlius Vulso in 187, an attempt was made to deny him a triumph. In the same year two tribunes, the Petillii, called on Lucius Scipio to render an account in the Senate for the moneys received from Antiochus and, when Publius Scipio tore up the accounts in anger, they brought before the assembly a bill asking the praetor (who in the absence of the consuls was the highest magistrate at Rome) to request the Senate to name and empower a praetor to conduct an investigation.¹ This motion was passed after a bitter discussion in which Cato made a speech² against the Scipios. The Senate obeyed orders and appointed Terentius Culleo to hear the case, and we may be sure that the debate in the senate was bitter. The trial seems not to have come off that year; possibly Terentius postponed action till his year of office ran out. In the sequel of 185-4 we are not here interested.

The main contention of the Catonian party in their first assault upon the Scipios was the same as in Cato's attack upon Acilius, namely that the general had not turned over to the treasury all the booty (including in this case an instalment of the indemnity), though the laws required the quaestors to keep careful accounts. Scipio's defense seems to have been that custom, the *mos majorum*, gave the proconsul supreme power

¹ See Livy 38, 53 ff., Mommsen, in *Röm. Forsch.* II, 417 ff.; De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, IV, 591 ff.; Frank in *Cambridge Ancient History*, VIII, 371.

² De pecunia regis Antiochi.

as regards the disposal of the booty; and he must have acted on this theory since he somehow found money to give his troops an extra stipend after their victory. Scipio's impulsive destruction of the records—no breach of law, according to his contention—led, of course, to bitter charges of arrogance. Though Livy's account of the affair is not to be trusted in its entirety, the tone of the speeches that he purports to quote is in accord with what Polybius gives and his account doubtless conveys some of the phrases used. The accusers, according to Livy, charged that Scipio was acting the part of a dictator (38, 51, 3); Cato *adlatrare magnitudinem eius solitus erat* (38, 54, 1), and Petillius, Cato's henchman, spoke of Scipio's *nobilitatem et regnum* (38, 54, 6).

Now the *Trinummus* of Plautus, which boasts of being a very chaste play, does not confine its sermonizing to the ordinary vices. Every exhortation in the play quickly turns into an attack upon the aristocrats and their insolence. In the very first speech of Megaronides, where the reader expects a puritanic onslaught fitting the occasion, we get instead a tirade against rank—which surprises us because the speaker (Megaronides) is of the same class as the criticized (ll. 34, 35):

Nimioque hic pluris *pauciorum* gratiam
faciunt pars hominum quam id quod prosint *pluribus*.

And the same tone discovers itself in Philto's criticism (297), where the word *boni* is used in the political sense:

Nil ego istos moror faeceos mores, turbidos, quibus *boni*
dedecorant se.

The monologue of the slave Stasimus in the unnoticed presence of Charmides (1023 ff.) seems to me quite packed with allusions to the Cato-Scipio debate. Plautus probably did not wish to appear openly taking sides between two powerful parties. He therefore pretends to motivate the speech by having Stasimus imagine that he has been robbed (1023). But at the end of the speech Plautus hints that his sermon had a political reference:

sum insipientior qui *rebus curem publicis* (1057).

When Stasimus began with the words (1028) *utinam veteres hominum mores*³ the audience was probably reminded of

³ In this whole passage, and especially in ll. 1032-7, Plautus uses *mores* as a true plural of *mos*.

Scipio's appeal to *mos majorum*; at any rate it doubtless caught the allusion when Charmides exclaimed (1030):

Di immortales, *basilica* hicquidem *facinora* inceptat loqui!
for Cato had delivered a speech *de pecunia regis Antiochi*. An even more sarcastic reference to Scipio's contention seems to occur a few lines further on (1037):

mores *leges* perduxerunt iam in potestatem suam,
and the next line—taken doubtless as a preposterous joke—might stand as a reference to Scipio's alleged betrayal of the state for the sake of recovering his son from Antiochus:

magisque *is sunt obnoxiosae quam parentes liberis*,
and the final fling at "custom" that supersedes law is found in 1043-4:

leges *mori* *serviunt*,
mores *autem* *rapere properant qua sacrum qua publicum*.

This—I take it—is as much as to say that the generals, in pocketing booty under the pretext of "custom" (as was alleged) cheat the public treasury and the expectation of the gods for temples. In fact the great victory at Magnesia led to no temple-building—which must have surprised Rome.

The whole speech of Stasimus in fact has nothing to do with the action of the play. Its references to Roman conditions (*ambitio* 1033; *leges fixae*, 1039) indicate a Plautine insertion. I suggest that it is to be taken as a commentary—though not too serious—on the speeches that the people had recently heard in the assembly of 187 against and in defence of the Scipios.

There are a few other phrases in the play that point to the same general period, though not so definitely.⁴ Line 1034:

Ambitio jam more sanctast, liberast a legibus,
would seem to indicate that there had been some unsuccessful agitation on the subject of repressing electioneering. Livy indicates repeatedly that the evils of *ambitus* were growing from

⁴ In commenting on l. 84:

Nam nunc ego si te surrupuisse suspicer
Jovi coronam,

Ritschl recalled the reference in Horace *Sat.* I, 4, 94 to a Petillius charged with stealing Jove's crown, and suggested that the Petillius who attacked Scipio might be the person alluded to by Plautus as well as by Horace. Critics have dropped the suggestion because of

about 192. However, it was not till 181 that a law was finally passed. Line 1034 doubtless refers to some of the earlier proposals for such legislation.

Line 484:

cena hac annona est sine sacris hereditas

is, of course, a reference to high prices and hard times. Now we know that from 191 to 188 all spare grain had to be sent to the armies and fleets operating in the east, so that there was no surplus. Then in 189 the rains were so heavy that the Tiber overflowed its banks twelve times (Livy 38, 28, 4). Prices must have risen very high, for the aediles took legal action that winter against several grain merchants (Livy 38, 35). The next year a serious pestilence broke out, lasting into 187 when a three-day *supplicatio* was declared for the welfare of the people (Livy 38, 44, 7). Such a pestilence would, of course, affect farm labor, and it would also create the moral temper noticeable in the party squabbles of the year, not to speak of the tone of the play in question. By the year 184 the economic stress had apparently quite passed over, since Cato with his eye, as usual, on the crops could make an address *de lustris sui felicitate*. Line 484 would then fit well into the situation in 187 B. C.

I would also suggest that line 545:

sed Campanis genus
multo Syrorum jam antedit patientia

is not, as usually taken, a late reference to the supposed enslavement of the Campanians in 209. In fact, historians now know that the Capuans were not enslaved. It is rather a reference to the humble request for rights of *conubium* made by the Campanians in 188 (Livy 38, 36, 5). They had in point of fact been enrolled as citizens the year before (Livy 38, 28, 3) and

Porphyrio's comment on the Horatian line. But Porphyrio is a careless guide, and all through the fourth Satire Horace uses old Lucilian characters. The coins of the Petillii (Grueber, nos. 4217-25) prove distinctly that the family had of old had charge of the Capitoline temple. It is quite possible that the friends of Scipio invented some charge against Petillius by way of a *tu quoque*. It was one of the Scipios who paid for the gilded chariot group of the Capitoline in 189 (Livy 38, 35, 4). I should therefore accept Ritschl's suggestion that line 84 of the *Trinummus* is another allusion to the recriminations of these exciting days; but of course Plautus had the good sense to consider the charge a joke.

one would have supposed that such rights might have followed, but somehow they had been denied. An Umbrian like Plautus may well have felt a deep sympathy for these Capuans who had to come and beg year after year for civil treatment. The reference to their *patientia* fits well into a play produced in the spring of 187.

And finally the puritanic tone of the whole play, as has often been pointed out, fits excellently into the period when Cato was carrying on his crusades.⁵

To summarize, I think that the *Trinummus* was played at the Megalensian games of 187 and that it contains several allusions to the all-engrossing debates then going on between the partisans of Scipio and of Cato. The nature of these allusions is interesting. Plautus does not mention names—that was tabu after the experiences of Naevius—and he even guards himself so far as to give to Stasimus a plausible motivation in personal experience for his sermon on morals (l. 1023). He contents himself with harping on words and phrases that everybody had heard in the public debates and that had become common talk, and he skilfully weaves these into his dialogue, sometimes with a humorous twist. However, it is not difficult to see that his sympathy is with the Catonian side. His dislike for the arrogance of the haughty nobles overriding law rings quite sincere, while the allusion to the alleged theft of the crown of Jupiter—a charge brought by Cato's opponents—at once brands the deed as impossible (in columine summo). Plautus has not many explicit allusions to the party politics of his day,⁶ and this one is so carefully guarded that later readers lost the application (cf. Cic. *de Rep.* 4, 11). But historians who know the 38th book of Livy well will hardly fail to see that Plautus in writing the *Trinummus* made something of the chance to get fun out of the very exciting contests of 187.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

⁵ The *Captivi* is in this respect very like the *Trinummus* but goes a step farther in heavily emphasizing both in the prologue and in the epilogue its moral qualities. This play would fall very well into the year of Cato's censorship, the last year of Plautus' life.

⁶ Evanthius, III, 6, has noticed that Plautus has more than Terence, and that they are apt to be obscure: adde quod nihil abstrusum ab eo (Terentio) ponitur aut quod ab historicis requirendum sit, quod saepius Plautus facit et eo est obscurior multis locis.

PLATO IN AFGHANISTAN AND INDIA.

[Alberuni in his *Enquiry into India* (c. 1030 A. D.) has many quotations from Plato and other Greek writers which are sometimes of use to the textual critic. (In *Timaeus* 25 d he perhaps read *κάπρα παχέος*.) Unfortunately he used adaptations of Plato rather than translations proper. Were these adaptations (a) identical with, or (b) based on, the Arabic 'translations' of Plato of which we hear in medieval Arabic sources? Or were they based on the 6th century Persian translation of Plato mentioned by Agathias? It is suggested that a literal Latin rendering might be made of the Arabic MS Aya Sofiya 2410.]

Al-Bīrūnī, *alias* al-Bērūnī, hereinafter plain Alberuni,¹ was born in the suburbs of Khiva in 973 A. D. In 1017 his country was conquered by King Mahmud the Gaznevide (as Gibbon calls him) and he was carried off to the conqueror's capital, Ghazna in Afghanistan. Much or all of the time from then till 1030 was spent by him in India, where he collected the materials for his great *Enquiry into India*, completed by him shortly after Mahmud's death in 1030. It was about the same time that he settled in Ghazna, where he died in 1048.²

Himself ignorant of Greek,³ Alberuni introduces many quotations from Greek authors into his book. In particular he quotes a considerable number of times from the *Phaedo*, *Timaeus* and *Laws* of Plato. These citations are for the most part so free that it is ordinarily impossible to say which of the variants in any given passage is represented in them. The following, however, are certain:—*Phaedo* 65 c 5 (I p. 71 Sachau) *που τότε* (TW Iambl.) or *τότε* (B²), not *τοῦτό τε* (B); *ibid.* 81 d 8 (I p. 65 Sachau) *τροφῆς* (BT u.v. W), not *τρυφῆς* (B²); *ibid.* 108 c 4 (I p. 66 Sachau) *θεῶν* (B² TW Stob.), not *ῥσων* (B); *ibid.* 114 a 5 (I p. 66 Sachau) *κύμα* (BTW Euseb.), not *ῥεῦμα* (Stob.). Equally certainly Alberuni supports the corrupt *θεῶν* (*ῥν*) in

¹ Henceforward I omit all diacritical marks in the transliteration of Oriental names.

² For the facts of Alberuni's life, see especially the preface to E. C. Sachau, *Alberuni's India, English Edition*, London, 1888 (reprinted 1910). Cp. Brockelmann in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* I (1913), p. 726 f., C. A. Nallino in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* VII (1930), p. 87 f., E. G. Browne, *Literary History of Persia* II (1906), pp. 96-98. According to V. A. Smith, *The Early History of India* (³1914), p. 15, n. 1, the correct title of Alberuni's work is *An Enquiry into India*.

³ Cf. Sachau, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. xli.

Timaeus 41 a 7 (AFY, Cicero, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Chalcidius, Stobaeus, etc.) against the palmary emendation of Badham, ὅσων.

More interesting, but unfortunately much more doubtful is the evidence which he supplies regarding *Timaeus* 25 d 3-7, which I here subjoin with a critical apparatus:—

Διὸ καὶ νῦν ἄπορον καὶ ἀδιερεύνητον γέγονεν τοῦκῃ πέλαγος, πηλοῦ
κάρτα βραχέος ἐμποδὼν ὄντος, ὃν ἡ νῆσος ἰζομένη παρέσχετο.

Var. Lect. κάρτα βραχέος] κάρτα βαθέος A (sed ρταβ et θ in ras.), cp. Philo, *Inc. Mu.*, p. 514 M.: κατὰ βραχέος γρ. A^{ms} (sed ad κάρτα schol. σφόδρα) Y: καταβραχέος F: καταβαχέος Proclus.

κάρτα βραχέος is read by Schneider, Stallbaum, C. F. Hermann, Susemihl, Burnet, Fraccaroli and Rivaud; κάρτα βαθέος by Bekker, Martin, Apelt (u.v.) and Taylor, the last of whom gives cogent reasons for preferring βαθέος to βραχέος. Chalcidius, however, in his free rendering of the *Timaeus* reproduces our sentence by *nisi quod pelagus illud pigrius quam cetera crasso dehiscentis insulae limo et superne fluctibus concreto habetur*, and Mr. E. R. Bevan has plausibly suggested⁴ that *crasso* here represents κάρτα παχέος, which would be intrinsically at least as good as κάρτα βαθέος. Alberuni does not formally quote the sentence, but there is apparently an echo of it in the following passage (Sachau, *op. cit.* I, p. 196):—

The reader is to imagine the inhabitable world, ἡ οἰκουμένη, as lying in the northern half of the earth, and more accurately in one-half of this half—i. e. in one of the quarters of the earth. It is surrounded by a sea, which both in west and east is called 'the comprehending one'; the Greeks call its western part near their country ὠκεανός. This sea separates the inhabitable world from whatever continents or inhabitable islands there may be beyond it, both towards west and east; for it is not navigable on account of the darkness of the air, and the thickness of the water, because there is no more any road to be traced, and because the risk is enormous, whilst the profit is nothing. Therefore people of olden times have fixed marks both on the sea and its shores which are intended to deter from entering it.⁵

⁴ Cp. Taylor, *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, p. xiv, and Plato, *Timaeus and Critias translated into English*, p. 23, n. 1.

⁵ With the last sentence, cp. Dante, *D. C.*, *Inf.* xxvi, 107 ff., *quella foce stretta, | ov' Ercole segnò li suoi riguardi, | acciochè l'uom più oltre non si metta*. Is this purpose ever assigned to the Pillars of Heracles in classical literature? Moore, *Studies in Dante* I, cites no source for these lines. Is there by any chance any grist here for Prof. Asín's mill? [See, however, Brunetto Latini, *Il Tesoretto* ch. 11 ll. 117-136, referred

That the words I have italicized in the above derive from *Tim.* 25 d 3-7, as Sachau assumes, is made the more probable by the mention immediately before of possible continents or inhabitable islands beyond the Ocean, which it is natural to connect with *Tim.* 24e-25a.⁶ If so, the expression "the thickness of the water" affords some slight further support for *κάρτα παχείος*.⁷

Before we go on to inquire what was the precise nature of the source from which Alberuni derived his Platonic quotations, it may be well to point out that he was somewhat lax in his manner of using it. This will appear from a comparison of his two citations from *Tim.* 41 a 5 ff.

I, p. 35, Sachau

Plato says in his *Timaeus* [follows a sentence not found in the Greek]. Further he says: "God spoke to the gods, 'You are not of yourselves exempt from destruction. Only you will not perish by death. You have obtained from my will at the time when I created you, the firmest covenant.'"

... λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς (the created gods) ὁ τότε τὸ πᾶν γεννήσας τάδε — 'Θεοὶ θεῶν ὦν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς πατὴρ τε ἔργων, δι' ἐμοῦ γινόμενα ἅλντα ἐμοῦ γε μὴ ἐθέλοντος. τὸ μὲν οὖν δὴ δεθὲν πᾶν λυτόν, τό γε μὴν καλῶς ἀρμυσθὲν καὶ ἔχον εὖ λύειν ἐθέλειν κακοῦ· δι' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπέπερ γεγέννησθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ οὐδ' ἅλντοι τὸ πάμπαν, οὐτι μὲν δὴ λυθήσεσθέ γε οὐδὲ τεύξεσθε θανάτου μοίρας, τῆς ἐμῆς βουλῆσεως μείζονος ἔτι δεσμοῦ καὶ κυριωτέρου λαχόντες ἐκείνων οἷς ὅτ' ἐγίγνεσθε συνεδείσθε'.

I, p. 231, Sachau

Plato says: "God spoke to the seven planets: 'You are the gods of the gods, and I am the father of the actions; I am he who made you so that no dissolution is possible; for anything bound, though capable of being loosened, is not exposed to destruction, so long as its order is good.'"

to by Moore, *op. cit.* III p. 124. Tac. *Germ.* 34 (*cit. Id. ibid.* p. 123 n. 2) has nothing to do with the Straits of Gibraltar.]

⁶ This might, however, come from Ps.-Arist., *De Mundo*, 392b23 ff., for Alberuni has three quotations (not noted by Sachau) from that work, for his acquaintance with which he was indebted, as I will show elsewhere, to the Syriac version of Sergius Resainensis (d. 536 A.D.).

⁷ The "darkness of the air" does not come from the *Timaeus*. The far west was, of course, traditionally wrapped in gloom (cp. e.g. Hom., *Od.* xi, 13-19), but I know of no passage in Greek literature where the Ocean is represented as innavigable on account of darkness. That notion is found in Rhet. Anon. *ap. Sen. Suas.* i, § 1, 12 f. Edw. (quoted by Moore, *Studies in Dante* III, p. 118), Moschus (a Greek rhetorician), *ibid.* § 2, 31-33, Fabianus *ibid.* § 4, 20 f., and the poet Pedo *ibid.* § 15, 9-12 and 24 f.; further, in Q. Curt. ix, 4, 18 (quoted by Edward on *Sen. Suas.* § 1, 10). Very possibly, the rhetoricians derived it from Greek scientific or semi-scientific sources, but Alberuni may simply have

This laxity, however, will hardly account for all the wide divergences between Alberuni's quotations from Plato and the original text. Sachau is doubtless right in saying (II, p. 278) that what he used was not simple translations of the text of the *Phaedo* and *Timaeus*, but rather works in which "text and commentary were mixed together, and the original form of a dialogue was changed into that of a simple narration," which, however, Alberuni erroneously held to be the original form of the books. Sachau assumes that these works were in Arabic, but does not carry the question further.

Now according to Carra de Vaux⁸ "A translation of the *Timaeus* has been corrected by Yahya b. Adi (according to the *Fihrist* [composed in 987 A. D.] and Ibn al-Kifti [1172-1248 A. D.]); in another place (in the works just mentioned) there is said that the *Timaeus* was translated by Ibn al-Bitrik and Hunain b. Ishak [d. 873 A. D.]." Was this the work used by Alberuni or was it a real translation? Probably the latter, if we may judge by the extant Arabic translation of the *Poetics* and the medieval Latin versions of Arabic translations of other Aristotelian writings.⁹ The question could probably be settled definitely without very great trouble. For Carra de Vaux tells us (*l. c.*) that "a MS of Constantinople (Aya Sofiya No 2410) bears the title of *The book of Plato called Timaeus on philosophy*." Will not some Arabic scholar give us a literal Latin rendering of a few pages of this MS? In spite of the labours of Schanz, Král, Burnet and others, the textual criticism of Plato has not yet become an idle pastime, and, copious as the indirect tradition already is, an Arabic version of the *Timaeus* made in the ninth or tenth century might prove of some value for the establishment of the original text, of which the three authoritative MSS (AFY)¹⁰ belong respectively to s. ix, s. xiv and s. xiv/xv.

taken it from the Arabs, who, however they came to have it, "had a strange horror of the Atlantic, 'the green sea of darkness'" (Moore, *l. c.*).

⁸ *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* I, p. 173, s. v. *Aflatun*. Cf. Steinschneider, *Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen in Beihefte zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Bd. IV, p. 148 (= Heft 12, p. 20).

⁹ See the specimens of the latter given in Jourdain, *Recherches sur les anciennes traductions latines d'Aristote* (1843), pp. 404 sqq.

¹⁰ W in the *Clitophon*, *Republic* and *Timaeus* is quite different from

The only evidence for the existence of an Arabic version of the *Phaedo*, apart from Alberuni's citations, appears to consist of a single quotation from it by Masudi (d. 956/7 A. D.).¹¹

There is perhaps one other possibility, which it seems worth putting forward, even if only for disproof by an Orientalist. Though he wrote all his chief works, including that on India, in Arabic, Alberuni was almost certainly Persian by race, and he wrote one or two minor treatises in that language.¹² Now Agathias (ii, p. 66, ed. Paris) tells us that King Chosroes I (regn. 531-579 A. D.) had Persian (Pahlavi)¹³ translations of Plato and Aristotle made for him "by someone."¹⁴ Was Alberuni's acquaintance with Plato mediated through this source? The same question may be raised regarding the Persian poet Nizami (1141-1203 A. D.) and the channel through which he obtained his knowledge of the story of Gyges' Ring in Plato, *Republic* II.¹⁵ Was that channel the anonymous Persian translation of Plato or was it the Arabic translation of the *Republic* by Hunain b. Ishak, as Cowell (*l. c.*, p. 156) suggested?

W. L. LORIMER.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

W in the other dialogues, a fact of which Rivaud, who collated it for his edition of the *Timaeus*, appears to have been unaware. See Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, p. 237.

¹¹ Cp. Carra de Vaux, *l. c.* There were also translations of the *Republic*, *Sophist*, *Laws*, and (perhaps) *Apology*.

¹² Cp. Nallino in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* VII, p. 88; Houdas in *La grande Encyclopédie* VI (1888), p. 924; also, Sachau, *op. cit.* I, p. 19, II, p. 260.

¹³ Steinschneider, *op. cit.*, n. 106, oddly supposes that the translation was into Syriac. Agathias, however, says ἐς τὴν Περσίδα φωνήν. I imagine these versions are wholly lost, but I have not been able to see West's catalogue of extant Pahlavi literature in *Sitzb. Bay. Akad. phil.-hist. Kl.* 1888.

¹⁴ Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, p. 200, ascribes the Persian translation of Plato to Uranius, presumably the Uranius of whom Agathias goes on to speak at length after mentioning the translations. Agathias does not say anything to suggest that Uranius was their author, and his silence strongly suggests that he did not regard him as such.

¹⁵ See E. B. Cowell in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxx (1861), pp. 151-157 (cp. J. Adam, *The Republic of Plato*, Vol. I, p. 127).

HIPPONIENSIS.

[Renewed discussion of the form.—Ed.]

Mr. Holmes V. M. Dennis¹ has recently claimed that the form Hipponensis has a right to recognition along with Hipponiensis, though he admits that the latter is preferable. When he produces an example of the shorter form prior to the death of Augustine (A. D. 430), it will then and then only obtain *droit de cité*. In a matter of this sort, inscriptions are most authoritative: the manuscripts must be estimated according to their date and character. If some manuscripts did not give Hipponensis, no editor would have printed it, and it is only in these latter days that matters of spelling are beginning to get their due attention.

Of the inscriptions given by Dessau in his *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (vol. III [Berolini, 1916], pp. 622 f.), three abbreviate the adj. as 'Hipp.', two give 'Hipponiensis'; in the third case where -onenses is given on the stone, it has been expanded, perhaps wrongly, to Hipponenses. As to the Corpus itself the evidence is as stated by Mr. Dennis. In all five inscriptions where the adjective is engraved in full, it is Hipponiensis. If he had cast his net a little wider, and, consulted S. Gsell, *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie*, tom. I (Paris, 1922), he would have found in his inscription no. 3992 two more examples of the adjective with the i. Thus seven inscriptional examples of Hipponiensis occur. There are in addition four where the adjective is abbreviated to HIPP. There is as yet no geographical index to CIL VI, VIII (suppl.), XI, XIII, from which to get more examples.

De Vit stated the case not so badly in his *Onomasticon* years ago, when he said that the longer form was found in inscriptions, the longer and the shorter in MSS. My position is that the shorter form is degenerate, and I will continue to believe so until it is furnished by an inscription of good date.

The writer appears to be but little acquainted with the progress of the textual criticism of the Elder Pliny. He tells us that 'Sillig's text', which he calls 'the traditional text', whatever that may mean, reads Hipponensem. But Sillig's text

¹ Vol. LII (1931), 274-277.

(1853-8) was superseded by Detlefsen's (1866-1873), and Detlefsen's in its turn was superseded by Jan's and Mayhoff's. The standard text at present is Mayhoff's (vol. I dated 1906). Mayhoff as a matter of fact prints *Hipponiensem*,² that is, he deliberately prefers the longer form, though he has MS authority for the other also. There is more Augustinian evidence for the longer form than was available to Christopher or myself. Mr. Dennis has himself added five Augustinian examples to those Christopher and I gave. It falls to me to add that the British Museum MS (Add. 14784, saec. XII) of Augustine's works gives *ipponiensis*, which points to *Hipponiensis* in an ancestor of this MS, and is, in my opinion, a testimony to the good character of its tradition. Dom Germain Morin, who is probably the greatest living authority on St. Augustine, prints *Hipponiensis* (for example, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, vol. I [Rome 1930], pp. 593, 804); so does Dom André Wilmart, in the second volume of the same work (for example, p. 149, *bis*). These eminent scholars would appear to be in no doubt what the correct form is. But there is evidence outside Augustine himself. In the ancient Latin MSS of the Canons of Councils, whose evidence is published with extreme accuracy by C. H. Turner in his *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, vol. I, pp. 302, 579, 586, cf. 595, the longer form has an almost absolute predominance. Many, perhaps most, very old MSS of Augustine make no reference to his diocese at all; otherwise we should have had more evidence even than we have, bearing on the point.

Mr. Dennis quite rightly refers to the evidence of Possidius. Possidius' text, as published by Weiskotten (Princeton, 1919), gives the shorter form always, and makes no mention of any variant in the critical notes. But I think it possible that Dr. Weiskotten may have omitted a mere orthographical matter like this from his apparatus, unless Mr. Dennis has received a personal assurance from him that the longer form occurs in none of his MSS. An *ex silentio* argument is dangerous.

The whole question of parallel forms would require examination by a philologist. The treatment in Stolz-Schmalz³, p. 236, is very brief. The parallels cited by me as long ago as 1900³ were meant merely to indicate that it was possible for forms

² As Mr. Dennis mentions.

³ *Classical Review*, vol. XIV, 264.

ending in -iensis to follow a stem ending in n. C(K)arthaginiensis certainly existed as well as Carthaginiensis, but the shorter form is probably degenerate there also. Marx failed to print pisciniensis in Lucilius, though the MS gives it, but pisciniensis appears in a Baiae inscription found in 1896.⁴ An inscription printed in the *Notizie degli Scavi*⁵ in 1929 gives Bouianiensis.

What is the explanation of the shorter form? Phonetic perhaps. The i became pronounced as y, and then in consequence disappeared from pronunciation altogether, and thus from writing.⁶ The second stage had happened as early as Lucilius' time in the case of pisciniensis, but Marx did not know this, and therefore printed the shorter form, against his manuscript, to satisfy the meter. But Virgil had to say *abyete*, etc., to get the words into his line.

A. SOUTER.

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY, SCOTLAND.

⁴ See my note in *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* XI (1898), pp. 130 f.

⁵ Ser. VI, vol. V, p. 214.

⁶ I do not believe that analogy would operate here in the opposite direction.

ON CATULLUS XXIX, 8.

ut albulus columbus aut Adoneus?

This line, although not one of the cruces of the text of Catullus, has caused considerable difficulty. None of the MSS gives the above reading which has now been generally accepted. GOa¹ have *ydoneus*, R Ven. et plerique *idoneus*. The present reading we owe to the edition of Statius,² from which time it has received recognition, if not acceptance, in all critical editions. The nineteenth century editors, however, did not adopt it with any unanimity. K. J. Sillig in his edition³ suggested *haut idoneus*, which was followed imprimis by Schwabe,⁴ Schmidt,⁵ and Munro.⁶ More recent editors, including Ellis,⁷ Baehrens-Schulze,⁸ Merrill,⁹ and Kroll¹⁰ have reverted to the reading *aut Adoneus*.

Two difficulties stand in the way of scholars who wish to accept Statius' suggestion. The first and less important is the form *Adoneus*. The *Thesaurus*¹¹ lists only two examples¹² of the form ending in *-eus* as opposed to scores of examples of the more normal forms *Adonis* and *Adon*. However, since these two examples occur in comedy and "nugae" respectively, their authority is deemed ample.¹³

The second and more formidable difficulty is that of interpretation. This question has been debated at least since the time of Doering,¹⁴ who, after accepting *aut Adoneus* and giving

¹ Ellis, Oxford, 1904.

² A. Statius, Venice, 1566.

³ Göttingen, 1823.

⁴ Giessen, 1866; Berlin, 1886.

⁵ Leipzig, 1887.

⁶ "Criticism and Elucidations of Catullus," Cambridge, 1878.

⁷ Oxford, 1904.

⁸ Leipzig, 1893.

⁹ Boston, 1893; Leipzig, 1923.

¹⁰ Leipzig, 1929.

¹¹ *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Vol. I, c. 803-05, Leipzig, 1900.

¹² Plaut. Men. 144; Ausonius Epigr. 30.6.

¹³ Baehrens, Comm. Leipzig, 1885, p. 182, called *-eus* form "vulgaris." Cf. Thes. l. c.

¹⁴ Leipzig, 1788.

his reasons, says, "Non video igitur cur in hoc loco tam interpretando quam corrigendo adeo se torserint interpretes."¹⁵

It has, of course, been generally recognized¹⁶ that doves are sacred to Venus, and that Adoneus refers to the youth beloved by her. Likewise most commentators¹⁷ have pointed out that Mamurra's successes depended on the patronage of Caesar. One further step, the identification of, or relation between, Venus and Caesar, will, I believe, give the correct interpretation.

We know that Caesar at the beginning of his curule career stressed his descent from Venus.¹⁸ The watchword at Pharsalus was Venus Victrix,¹⁹ which caused Pompey worry lest his troops be affected by the "reputation and distinction" of his rival.²⁰ The earliest coins issued by Caesar bore the figure or head of Venus.²¹ Throughout his life, then, Caesar constantly reminded the people of this intimate connection between himself and the goddess, a connection sanctioned after his death by his deification and by the policy of Augustus.²²

If therefore we keep in mind this at least partial identification of Caesar and Venus, Cat. XXIX, 8 will have exquisite point. Mamurra *perambulabit omnium cubilia* as one of the attendants in the train of Caesar (ut albulus columbus), or as the special favorite (aut Adoneus) of this divinely sprung commander. That in this case Mamurra resembles Adonis in no respect except in the favor of Venus, or rather of Venus's son, heightens rather than lessens the sting and irony of the line.

Further, this is just the kind of thing a witty and clever political opponent would choose to mock. The incongruity is admirably adapted for purposes of propaganda. To call the unprepossessing²³ Mamurra Adonis simply because he indulges

¹⁵ Op. cit. p. 90.

¹⁶ E. g. Ellis, Comm. Oxford, 1889. L. de Gubernatis, Turin, 1928.

¹⁷ E. g. Baehrens, Kroll op. cit.

¹⁸ Suet. D. Jul. 6.

¹⁹ Appian, Bell. Civ. II, ch. 76 ad fin. cf. ib. ch. 68, τὴν ἐαυτοῦ πρόγονον Ἀφροδίτην.

²⁰ Plut. Pomp. 68: δεδοικότα (sc. Πομπήϊον) μὴ τῷ γένει τῷ Καίσαρος εἰς Ἀφροδίτην ἀνήκοντι δόξα καὶ λαμπρότης ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γένηται.

²¹ B. M. Cat. of Coins, Rep. Vol. III, plate CX, no. 20; cf. Vol. I, p. 542n.; Vol. II, p. 469, nos. 31-35.

²² Cf. Verg. Aen. VI, 789 ff.

²³ "Hunc praefectum fabrum, Fortunae filium,—fuisse staturae magnae (115.7), macellum (57.6), ore foedum." Baehrens, Comm. p. 183.

in amorous adventures is at best but mildly amusing: in all essential respects the simile lacks the verisimilitude necessary for uproarious and lasting ridicule. To compare with Adonis this veteran whose popularity depended on such favor from Venus's descendant as Venus herself showed to Adonis is to make the comparison much more apt, and therefore much more ridiculous. It is even possible that these slights of Caesar's ancestry may be the "perpetua stigmata" ²⁴ of Suetonius.

EDWARD F. D'ARMS.

PRINCETON, N. J.

²⁴ Suet. D. Jul. 73.

THE GRAMMAR OF DRINKING HEALTHS.

In recent discussion ¹ of the drinking of healths at Macedonian and Greek banquets I feel that a clear distinction has not yet been made between the case used for the person challenged to drink and that for the person whose health is drunk. Tarn ² has explained the procedure for the actual drinking by the Greeks in the Hellenistic time when the custom of saying the name in the genitive as the wine was poured into the cup had established itself. The Homeric usage ³ was to say the name of the person honored in the vocative directly, with the addition of *χαῖρε*, as *χαῖρ Ἀχιλεῦ*.⁴

Miss Taylor ⁵ writes of the cases used, "We cannot draw a sharp line between drinking Alexander and drinking Alexander's health. The variation in the conception is shown by the fact that even for gods *πίνειν* is used with the dative, as well as with the genitive; for persons *προπίνειν* with the dative is used more frequently than *πίνειν* with the genitive." There is a slight inaccuracy here in quoting Tarn, which may be of some moment in the inference to be drawn. Tarn speaks of drinking "The King", with capitals and quotation marks. This does not seem to be equivalent to "drinking the king"; I should rather understand it as a short form for the ordinary expression "drink to the King". In Kipling's poem "The Native-Born" there is a succession of such *προπόσεις*.

We've drunk to the Queen—God bless her—
We've drunk to our mothers' land;
We've drunk to our English brother
(But he does not understand.)

.
I charge you fill your glasses—
I charge you drink with me
To the men of the Four New Nations
And the Islands of the Sea.

And so on through the entire poem. At the actual drinking of

¹ Tarn, W. W., JHS XLVIII, 1928, pp. 211 f. Taylor, L. R., The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, pp. 261-265.

² L. c.

³ Kircher, Sakrale Bedeutung des Weines, pp. 61, 66, 96.

⁴ Il. IX, 223 f.

⁵ Taylor, op. cit. p. 263.

these healths each one would be named separately,—“The Queen”, etc. Those who are challenged to drink in this poem would in Greek be in the dative case after *προπίνω* and those toasted would be in the genitive. This illustrates the point that appears to me to have been overlooked in Miss Taylor’s statement, and to support it I adduce the drinking scene in the Symposium of Lucian.⁶ There Alcidas, having drunk from his scyphus, *ἐπεπώκει γάρ*, challenges the bride, Cleanthis, to drink in honor of Heracles Archegetes. When ridiculed for his challenge he says “You laughed when I challenged this girl to drink in the name of (*ἐπί*) our god Heracles”. He urges her to take the scyphus from him. The passage reads: *προπίνω σοι, ἔφη, ὦ Κλεανθί, Ἑρακλέους ἀρχηγέτου. ὥς δ’ ἐγέλασαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἅπαντες, ἐγελάσατε, εἶπεν, ὦ καθάρματα, εἰ τῇ νύμφῃ προῦπιον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου θεοῦ τοῦ Ἑρακλέους;*

This passage, which I think no one has quoted in this discussion, because of its fullness shows quite clearly the difference between the dative for the person challenged and the genitive of the person toasted. A similar example of the full construction is to be found in Athenaeus 693 e—*προπιὼν αὐτῷ ἄκρατον ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος*—“having pledged him (i. e. Aesculapius) in unmixed wine in the name of the Good Daemon.” These two passages would seem to be a sufficient refutation of the idea that the genitive of the name of the god or man toasted was possibly “felt as a partitive genitive”, as Miss Taylor argues. The genitive *ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος* is evidently the genitive for the toast and *ἄκρατον* is object of the verbal part of *προπίνω* while *αὐτῷ* is the dative always associated with that verb for the person challenged to drink.⁷ Another word commonly used when healths are drunk is the verb *ἐπιχέω* with its derivative *ἐπίχυσις*. For the genitive with the latter I cite from Plutarch, Brutus 24: *ἐλθόντες εἰς τὸ πίνειν ἐπιχύσεις ἐποιούντο νίκης Βρούτου καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἐλευθερίας*. “When they came to the drinking they poured in wine (i. e. filled their cups) (in the name) of victory for Brutus and freedom for the Romans”. Here and in Plutarch, *Demetrius* 25, where a similar expression is used for pledging Demetrius as King, Seleucus as Elephant-leader, Ptolemy as Ship-captain,

⁶ Lucian, Sympos. 430, ch. XVI.

⁷ See for this genitive Ganschietz, s. v. Agathodaimon, P. W. Supplementband 3, Sp. 44. Also Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik (1898), Zweiter Teil, I. Bd., S. 376, Anm. 5.

Lysimachus as Guardian of the Treasury, and Agathocles as Sikeliot nesiarch, the genitives are not the material of the drinking (partitive) but the occasion of it, to be compared with ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου θεοῦ of Lucian.

The word *προπίνω* is not exactly the equivalent of the English expression "drink to", nor of the German "zutrinken". It means to drink the cup of wine before the one who is honored by the challenge of the first drinker, and often the cup itself is presented to the one who has taken it to drink from. The most famous example of this is the simile at the beginning of Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode, where the father of the bride gives to his son-in-law the gold cup with which he has challenged him to drink:

φιάλαν ὡς εἴ τις ἀφνειᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλὼν
 ἔνδον ἀμπέλου καχλάζουσιν δρόσῳ
 δωρήσεται
 νεανία γαμβρῷ προπίνων
 οἴκοθεν οἴκαδε πάγχρυσον κορυφὰν κτεάνων

Another example of this procedure is that of the gold cup which Alexander promises to Ariston, the Paeonian prince:⁸ "I shall drink before you and present you the cup full of unmixed wine". The word *προπίομαι* in the passage has the double meaning of drink before and present. From this practice comes the meaning of the verb in Aeschylus, *frag.* 131, Euripides, *Rhesus*, 405, Demosthenes 18, 296, etc., of treacherously surrendering.

The address of which Athenaeus⁹ speaks (*προέπινον μετὰ προσγορεύσεως*) is found in the passage which I have cited from Lucian. Kircher¹⁰ refers to the scholium on Pindar, *Nem.* III, 132, and suggests that some salutation later also accompanied the *proposis*.

In general *προπίνω* is used either as in the passage from Arrian,¹¹ so often quoted, to start the drinking "in a circle", or else for an honour for a single individual, when it is often accompanied by a gift either of the cup offered or of some other object of value. In the banquet of Seuthes¹² a white horse, a slave-boy, robes for Seuthes' wife, a silver phiale, and a valuable rug were among the things given with the formula *προπίνω σοι ὃ*

⁸ Plut. Alex. 39.

⁹ Athen. 498 d.

¹⁰ Op. cit. p. 96.

¹¹ Anab. IV, 12.

¹² Xen. Anab. VII, 3.

Σεύθη καὶ δωροῦμαι. The wine was in this case drunk from a horn. This πρόποισις with a gift (ἀποδωρεῖσθαι) and the mention of the person's name is said by Critias¹³ to have been an importation from Asia. He says that the Spartans have no such custom, but drink from their own cups, while the habit of drinking from big cylixes ἐπιδέξια is characteristic of Thasos and Chios, while the Thessalians challenge individuals with their great drinking cups.

I do not attempt in this note to discuss the primitive and religious conceptions which are involved in the drinking of healths. They are investigated by Kircher in his well-known book on *Sakrale Bedeutung des Weines*. I desire to make clear that the πρόποισις, challenge to drink by drinking before another and handing the cup to him (whether or not for a permanent possession), while constituting an honour to the person addressed, does not necessarily involve drinking his health, and that the toast is in the Hellenistic and Roman periods given in the genitive case. As the preposition ἐπί in the passage in Lucian and the dative, accusative and genitive in that passage and in Athen. 693e show, the genitive is not partitive, but gives the occasion and cause¹⁴ of the drinking and is well though not literally rendered by our preposition "to" (the person toasted). The Macedonians evidently had both the custom of drinking ἐπιδέξια and of challenging with "great cups". Cf. Critias, loc. cit. ὁ μὲν Χίος καὶ Θάσιος ἐκ μεγάλων κυλίκων ἐπιδέξια, ὁ δὲ Θετταλικὸς ἐκπώματα προπίνει ὅτῳ ἂν βούλωνται μεγάλα. The soldiers in Alexander's army, when they challenged one another to drink (Plut. Alex. 67) drank not to one another, but to any toast that each one desired. So in Theocritus XIV, as the drinking goes on, each reveller may pour in for a toast for whomever he will. That toast according to the custom of the time would be in the genitive, the wine drunk, or poured in, with προπίνω and ἐπιχέω is in the accusative, or, as in Theocritus II, 152, in the partitive genitive.

GRACE H. MACURDY.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

¹³ FHG II, 68; Athen. 463.

¹⁴ In Pindar, Is. III, 81, the use of ἔμπυρα, burnt sacrifice, with the dependent genitive "in honor of the dead", is exactly parallel in construction. No one would dream of calling the genitive here partitive.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGOLOGIE, III, Troisième Série (1929).

Pp. 5-12. Jérôme Carcopino. Correction au *Brutus* XXVIII, 109. M. Carcopino restores in this passage *faecem* for *facile* of the mss. or the *facete* of the accepted texts. This correction renders the usual change in word order needless, is in harmony with history and paleography and gives sense to a passage quite inept as usually restored.

Pp. 13-29. L. Lemarchand. Dion de Pruse, Observations critiques sur le texte des discours LXVI et XII. In treating these two discourses of Dion, the *Περὶ δόξης α'* and *Ὀλυμπικός*, M. Lemarchand rejects certain interpolations that break or mar the logical continuity and transposes certain portions to their appropriate and logical position. His treatment is logical and illuminating.

Pp. 30-42. A. Ernout. A propos d'une histoire de la langue latine. A sympathetic and brilliant résumé of M. Meillet's book. M. Ernout's article is a model of its kind and merits his own appraisal of his associate's work: "Après l'avoir lu, l'esprit se sent plus riche, non pas seulement d'une somme des faits, mais de toute la substance d'un profond esprit."

Pp. 43-63. P. Wuilleumier. Les manuscrits principaux du Cato Major. The author first gives a detailed description of five mss. of the ninth and tenth centuries. Then he treats of another ms., D, and of corrections founded on its variants, abbreviations and omissions, and finally of the ms.-tradition of the Cato Major.

Pp. 64-75. Gustave Glotz. Notes et discussions. The books reviewed are, *The Minoan-Mycenean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*, by Martin P. Nilsson, and *Alt-Ithaka*, by Wilhelm Doerpfeld.

Pp. 75-95. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 96. Derniers ouvrages reçus.

Pp. 97-121. Georges Seure. Inscriptions ignorées du littoral balkanique de l'Euxin. A discussion of certain Greek inscriptions already published and of almost unique value in reference to this region. The treatment comes under five heads: 1) Indigenous proper names, 2) Epitaphs, 3) Dedications, 4) Names and titles of the Dieu Cavalier, 5) Funeral verses.

Pp. 122-158. Louis Robert. Études d'épigraphie grecque. A continuation of the article by M. Robert in the *Revue* for the previous year. The subjects discussed are: VII. Inscription

d'Adalia. VIII. Noms méconnus. IX. Inscription agonistique de Pergé. X. Pierres errantes. XI. Inscriptions de Thyatire. XII. Une inscription copiée par Cockerell. XIII. ΕΙΣΑΓΟΡΕΥΣ. XIV. Inscription d'Iasos. XV. Inscriptions de Stratonicee. XVI. Inscription agonistique d'Erythrai. XVII. Inscription de Kallatis. XVIII. Inscription de Varna. XIX. Inscriptions agonistiques de Philippopolis. XX. Décrets de Cyrène.

Pp. 159-183. Georges Mathieu. Notes sur Athènes à la veille de la guerre lamiaque. These notes embrace three discussions: I. The Athenian general Leosthenes and certain of his associates. With a view to establishing greater clarity and precision in our knowledge of the events of the Lamian War, especially of its earlier period, the author supplements the information from such sources as Diodorus, Plutarch, Pausanias, and the Funeral Oration of Hyperides over those who fell in the siege of Lamia, with a study of the Hibeh Papyri and the ephebic inscription from Oropus which contains the names of magistrates crowned by the Ephebi of the tribe Leontis. This inscription is further utilized II. to obtain interesting information of Athenian families, and III. to extend our knowledge concerning the population of the tribe Leontis during the fourth century B. C.

Pp. 184-189. N. Deratani. Le réalisme dans les *declamations*. The author shows that the themes, originally Greek, at times take on Roman coloring and reflect Roman life. The method is to study historically the character of the theme, be it Greek, Roman or mixed, and then to determine the degree of realism that comes from and reflects Roman life.

Pp. 190-194. Paul Couissin. Notes et discussions. A review of Emanuel Löwy's book, *Die Anfänge des Triumphbogens*, which with certain reservations the reviewer commends.

Pp. 195-242. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 243-244. Derniers ouvrages reçus.

Pp. 245-270. Jean Noiville. Les Indes de Bacchus et d'Héraclès. A fascinating paper which shows that the 'war' of Bacchus against the 'Indians' hides under a veil of myth an historic reality. The 'India' in question was not on the banks of the Indus but in the remote region of the plain of Kuban and the lower Don, and the shores of the sea of Azof where the Sindes lived in historic times, the debris of the great conquered nation, beyond the mysterious walls of the Caucasus, which Alexander feigned to have crossed, in order to conquer another India far surpassing in riches and extent the 'India' of Bacchus and Hercules.

Pp. 271-280. Félix Gaffiot. La Première Satire de Perse.

M. Gaffiot believes that the proverbial obscurity of Persius has increased under the mass and subtlety of the commentaries and that this must yield to a direct and attentive study of the text itself. Applying this method to the first satire he gives a translation that reproduces clearly the thoughts and their development and he follows this up with a commentary on the more obscure passages.

Pp. 281-285. E. Cavaignac. Miltiade et Thucydide. The author believes that the story in Herodotus of Miltiades' attempt to carry out the Scythian project of destroying the Persian army by breaking down the Danube-bridge was true and not an invention of Miltiades, for whom it had very serious results. In support he gives a genealogy that makes the parents of Thucydides—Oloros and Hegesipyle—first cousins, the one being the namesake of the wife of Miltiades (her grandmother), and the other the namesake of his own great-grandfather, the father-in-law of Miltiades. Assuming the first Oloros as king not in the Chersonese, but in the region of Pangaeus and bequeathing the mines there to his grandson, Cimon, we have light on the latter's interest in the Athenian expedition in this region and the later ownership of these mines by the historian, as well as on the political career of Miltiades.

Pp. 286-287. Fernand Robert. Notes sur Aristophane, *Guêpes*, vers 122-123. The author cites an inscription from Epidauros and a passage from Pausanias, which in agreement with the note of the scholiast make certain the existence at Aegina of the sanctuary of Asclepius mentioned in the text of Aristophanes.

Pp. 288-293. A. Maréchal. A propos de la Préface des *Nuits Attiques*. An inquiry as to the statement of Gellius: *Usi sumus ordine rerum fortuito, quem antea in excerpando feceramus*. M. Maréchal concludes we have no convincing reason to doubt the statement of Gellius, or to believe that he designedly jumbled up an assumed order in his work, in order to make it more attractive.

Pp. 294-300. P. Chantraine. Notes et discussions sur un trait du style homérique. A review and exposition of "L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère" and "Les formules et la métrique d'Homère," by Milman Parry, whose thesis is that the diction, so far as it consists of literary formulas, is due solely to the influence of the verse and that the stock epithet never arises from the action of the moment and that the generic epithet does not express the characteristic that distinguishes one hero from another. The true originality of the poet lies in the portrayal of character, the dramatic structure and movement of the episodes. Hence the vast difference between the objective style of the ancient epic and the subjective style of modern literature.

Pp. 301-342. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 343-344. Derniers ouvrages reçus.

Pp. 345-347. J. E. Harry. Reine et Ville [Euripide, *Hécube*, 1215]. Read: *καπνώδες ἦμεν ἄστυ πολεμίων ὕπο*, which is "plus dramatique que le fade et banal *καπνῶ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστυ* of the mss.

Pp. 348-353. Félix Gaffiot. Texte du Pro Archia. M. Gaffiot contends that the editors of this oration have wrongly departed from the Gemblacensis, the best ms. of the Pro Archia, and proves his point by the many passages he cites.

Pp. 354-357. J.-R. Vieillefond. La lettre II, 1 d'Alciphron et la Chasse de Xénophon. An exposition of the method of Alciphron, who takes the general statement of Xenophon (De Venatione ζ'), and expands it into a concrete story with precise details.

Pp. 358-363. P. d'Hérouville. Zootechnie virgilienne: Le choix d'un bélier. An interesting discussion of Georgics III, 384-390, which shows that in the technique of sheep-raising for wool, Vergil is justified not only by ancient but modern authorities.

P. 364. L. Laurand. Pseudocicero adversus Valerium. M. Laurand makes the point that in imitating Cicero the author of this oration uses expressions that Cicero had discarded prior to the earliest possible date of the oration; further that the clausulae lack the perfection Cicero had attained; and finally that certain expressions, — e. g. in ore gladii — are utterly un-Ciceronian.

Pp. 365-395. A. Diès. Notes et discussions. Two Clarendon Press publications are discussed: A. E. Taylor, A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus, and Dorothy Tarrant, The Hippias Major, attributed to Plato, with introductory Essay and Commentary. M. Diès first seeks to show that the fundamental intention of Mr. Taylor's Commentary is to verify the hypothesis that the Timaeus does not give the opinions or discoveries of Plato, but those of noted Pythagoreans at the time of Socrates. Next he discusses a number of significant passages in the Timaeus in a manner invariably illuminating. The discussion of the Hippias Major turns largely on the arguments against authenticity and the conclusion is: "si ma confiance dans l'authenticité a jamais eu besoin d'être fortifiée, elle l'est, cette fois encore, par les objections mêmes qu'on y apporte.

Pp. 396-441. Bulletin bibliographique. Pp. 442-445. Derniers ouvrages reçus. Pp. 446-451. Table des matières.

CAROL WIGHT.

CHATHAM, MASS.

GLOTTA, XX (1931), 1-2.

Pp. 1-45. Emil Vetter, *Literaturbericht für die Jahre 1924-1929: Italische Sprachen.*

Pp. 46-53. Franz Brender, *Zu lat. fessus und gressus*, argues that fessus, from fatiscor, owed its e to a differentiation from fassus (fateor) and also to the influence of the semantically associated pressus; that gressus, from gradior, owed its e to the influence of cessus, notably in recessus, as well as to regressus, despite the counter-influence of passus 'Schritt'.

Pp. 54-62. G. N. Hatzidakis, *Alt- und Neugriechisches*, sees in dative χειροί (much used because hands are the most used of all tools) the start for the late popular τὴν χεῖρα with ε as against ει in the Attic etc., and in τὴν χεῖρα the basis for mediaeval τὸ χέρι, with recessive accent; and argues that the development of acc. μας σας etc. as possessive gen. (first occurrence of σας in this use, Porphyrogennetos, tenth century), came from the influence of the acc. ἐμένα ἐσένα etc. as emphatic forms for all cases.

Pp. 62-64. C. J. M. J. van Beek, *Romuli*, defends this reading in Tertull. de corona 12 (though it is not in any codex, and is merely an emendation of Beatus Rhenanus in his edition of 1521) as an elliptic dual, 'Romulus and Remus'.

Pp. 65-67. Paul Kretschmer, *Χθών*, explains Hittite degan and Tocharian tkan as from *dheghóm-, which gave also *dhghom; the latter, with metathesis of the initial consonants, is seen in Gk. χθών and Skt. kṣam-, and with loss of the initial dental, in Latin humus and the Balto-Slavonic cognates.

Pp. 67-73. Emil Vetter, *Messapische und venetische Wortdeutungen*: (1) Mess. ana is an epithet of Aphrodite, probably 'mother'; (2) Mess. lahona is another epithet of Aphrodite, 'Geburtshelferin', cf. Gk. Δεχώ and words surviving in Albanian and in modern Gk. dialects of South Italy; (3) Venetic lahvna, in two dedicatory inscriptions, is a borrowing from the Illyrian, the same as Mess. lahona; (4) Ven. vrotah means 'Wenderin', to the root vert-, cf. Hesych. βρατάναν· τορύνην, Ἡλείοι and Gk. ρατάνη 'Quirl'; Ven. rehtia, shown by Whatmough to be a goddess of healing invoked by women, like Gk. (Spart., Arg., Epid.) Orthia, is more precisely a goddess of childbirth; (6) Ven. H represented h from earlier k, before t, as is shown by writings of the words already discussed; | flanked by two shorter hastas or by two dots is only a later form of the same character.

Pp. 74-84. Fritz Conrad, *Die Deminutiva im Altlatein*: I. Die Deminutive bei Plautus (continued from XIX, 148), draws his conclusions that in Plautus the diminutives rarely if ever have merely diminutive meaning, but have taken on a tone

of affection or depreciation or jesting, or differ not at all from their primitives; many being used at the ends of verses for metrical convenience.

Pp. 84-94. Ernst Fraenkel, *Zu griechischen Inschriften*: 1) *Zu dem lokrischen Siedlungsgesetze*, *Insc. graec. sel.*⁴ 46; read ΑΓΧΙΣΤΕΔΑΝ as ἀγχιστήδαν; for the formation of (gen. pl.) ὑπαπροσθιδίων 'der früheren Besitzer', cf. Elean προστιζίδων, Collitz-Bechtel 1157. 7, and Gort. ἐνδοθιδίαν δώλαν, Coll. 4991. II. 11, and for the semantics of the prefix cf. ὑπόλοιπος as well as Latin proavus and pronepos, etc.; for the composition vowel in ἀνδρεφονικός, cf. ἀνδρεφόνος, Hom. ζέεδωρος, Herodian ἀλετρίβανος, Paus. 5, 3, 3 Θηρεφόνη; γονεῦσιν, ἀνδράσιν, πάντεσιν are the first West Greek examples of nu movable; ἄματα πάντα is a conventional formula, used despite the normal Locr. ἀμάρα. 2) *Zu den neugefundenen Inschriften von Cyrene*, Ferri ABA 1926, 3 ff., and Wilamowitz SBA 1927, 155 ff.: commentary on ἐννῇ '9'; τριτοπατέρων 'Urahnen', with retained ε in stem instead of the ο usual in compounds; κατελήλευθνῖα with ευ as in Cretan ἀμφεληλεύθεν Coll. 4999. II. 4, instead of the weak grade customary in the fem. ptc.; ἰα[ριτε]υκώτων and ἐφορευκώτων with peculiar -ω-; τένται for τέλται = τέλεται, cf. ἔσται ἔσεται; aor. subj. μιᾷ 'sündigt', fut. μασσει, to μιᾶ-, cf. μᾶστωρ, μαρός.

Pp. 93-94. Ernst Fraenkel, *Zur pleonastischen Privativpartikel im Griechischen*, cites as parallels Lith. nēganda(s) 'Unglück, Unheil', to gañdas gandra 'Schrecken', the superfluous negative being due to the pair neláimė 'Unglück', láimė 'Glück'; and Lith. nekliútas 'Unheil', which needs no negative, since it comes from kliúti 'hängen bleiben, festhaken'.

Pp. 94-100. Vittore Pisani, *Die Inschrift der Statuette von Auximum* (Jacobsohn, *Alt. Inscr.* 143): cais paiz variens iuve zal secure (last c engraved backwards) = Caius (sic!) Paetus Varienus Iovem Sol(em) cecidere (= caelavere, cf. Umb. prusekatu). In this, iuvezal is for iuvem sal, with ms > nts, written z with omission of preceding nasal, as in Umb.; *sal is neuter *sāwel; the verb is third pl. perf.

Pp. 101-150. Walter Goldberger, *Kraftausdrücke im Vulgärlatein* (continued from XVIII, 65): B. Körperliche Tätigkeiten, dealing with the ideas coire, gehen, sprechen, essen, trinken, and spiritual and intellectual activities; C. Körperliche Eigenschaften, including gross, klein, alt, jung, fett, wohlgenährt, mager, hübsch, hässlich, stark, schwach; Geistige Eigenschaften, including dumm, toll, schlau, etc.; in conclusion, a paragraph on the importance of the subject for the proper understanding of the language.

Pp. 150-152. Willy Krogmann, *Altprenest. vhevhihed*, argues that the misshaped second h in *fhefhaked* on the Praenestine Fibula CIL 1², 2, indicates that the maker started to engrave *fhefhihed* (misprint for *fhefhiked*?) as perf. to *finco*, the verb appropriate to pottery (cf. *Fal. fifiked*), and after cutting *fhe:fhi* realized his error and changed to a perfect of *facio*, appropriate for work in bronze.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

REVIEWS.

Der Glaube der Hellenen, von ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Band i. Berlin (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung), 1931. Pp. 412.

Having held his kingship even through three generations of men, the great scholar has now by his end placed the seal of happiness on his life. In the last pages of his last book he tells us of *δαίμονες* and *ψυχαί*, and the last word is "Heros". We who are still in the light will not soon forget to honor his memory nor fail to go to him still for guidance and blessing in our lesser works. *ὀλβιε καὶ μακαριστέ, θεὸς δ' ἔσῃ ἀντὶ βροτοῖο.*

It is fitting that in this last book Wilamowitz should deal directly with the subject which he has touched on so many sides. It is fitting, too, that of the last book we should have only the first half and the promise of the second; for this earnest of the future is a symbol of the inexhaustible profusion of his learning. We can only hope that the second half is so nearly completed that it can be printed substantially as he would have wished. The first volume closes with the Homeric gods; the second, he tells us in the preface, is to contain chapters on Panhellenische Götter, Weltgeltung und Verfall des Hellenentums, Restauration und Untergang. These chapters we can not willingly spare.

The first volume, which we have before us, is divided into five chapters and an appendix containing nine supplementary studies. The first chapter, "Gott und Götter", deals with certain general aspects of Greek religion and the attitude which the student should assume toward the subject. Great emphasis is laid on the importance of a sympathetic understanding of the actual belief of the Greeks in their gods. More than once the significant sentence is repeated: "Die Götter sind da." The forms of ritual are treated as secondary. The chapter as a whole is a combination of brilliantly expressed pronouncements and a running commentary on views with which the author disagrees. The anthropological method is expressly rejected. "Ich verstehe die Sprachen nicht, aus denen die zurzeit beliebten Wörter, Tabu und Totem, Mana und Orenda, entlehnt sind, halte es aber auch für einen zulässigen Weg, mich an die Griechen zu halten und über Griechisches griechisch zu denken". Again, later in the book, he returns to the same point, with the proud assertions: "Wer von Totemismus bei den Hellenen redet, beweist nur, dass er von ihnen nichts weiss;" and "Über andere Völker habe ich kein Urteil; die Griechen kenne ich." This principle is strictly observed throughout the book; and though the reader is not entertained by picturesque but often illusory parallels from

primitive religions, he is genuinely edified and instructed by the rich learning of a writer who has always sought to 'think Greek'.

The second chapter, "Die Wanderungen der hellenischen Stämme", is occupied with a subject to which Wilamowitz attaches great importance. There is, however, scarcely a word of religion in it, and it appears excessively long in this book, especially as its highly conjectural conclusions play little part in the subsequent discussion.

In the third and fourth chapters the gods of the Greek pantheon, great and small, pass in review. The first of these, "Vorhellenische Götter", presents a list of the gods whom the Greeks took over from the previous inhabitants of the lands in which they settled; but the author maintains that these gods did not exercise any profound influence on Greek religion. The following chapter, "Althellenische Götter", constitutes nearly one-half of the whole book. Here the author undertakes to determine on the basis of later evidence the state of religion among the Greek peoples before their southward migration and before the rise of the epic. It is a brilliant and ingenious reconstruction of a lost age, which rests on a multitude of conjectural conclusions, and since it is the most complete attempt of the kind which has yet been made, it is bound to stand as the authoritative treatment of the subject until it is modified in whole or in part by further research.

The last chapter, "Homerische Götter", describes the transformation to which the ancient religion and its gods were subjected by the Ionian rhapsodes. Poseidon, who had been a god of the earth and the greatest male deity, sinks to comparative insignificance as god of the sea. Zeus, an old weather-god, residing on the mountain-tops, is promoted from his lesser rank to be lord of all the gods. Apollo and other gods of Asia are added to the pantheon. The greatest change that was wrought by the Homeric epic is that, whereas of old the gods had dwelt in and on the earth in immediate association with men and their affairs, they were now removed to the sky and became a heavenly hierarchy with Zeus at their head.

Through the chapters which deal with prehistoric conditions we move like voyagers at sea. The ship in which we sail is stout; but we can scarcely ever forget that we are tossing on an uncertain element, and sometimes our vessel pitches badly. It is inevitable that in such a discussion there should be much of a highly controversial nature. Even when we come into the smoother waters of the Homeric gods, the ship rolls a little for a time. But at the end we set our feet on firm land, and in the second half of the last chapter we are told of things for which, puzzling though they may be, there is sure contemporary evidence, and this evidence is interpreted with Wilamowitz's usual

brilliance and penetration. The last pages of the book discuss such interesting topics as the increasing exaltation of Zeus, the rise of divine genealogies, the freedom of the human will, *αἰδώς*, fate, and *ψυχή*.

As the titles of the chapters indicate, the general treatment is historical, concluding with Homer; but there is much to be learned in the book about post-Homeric conditions as well. The author often yields to the temptation to carry on a particular topic beyond the period for which he begins the discussion. Besides, since the conclusions presented rest principally on evidence drawn from later times, much is said during the course of the book about religion in the classical period. The names of Pindar, Bacchylides, the tragedians, Plato, Callimachus, and many others appear on many pages.

It is not a book for one who would approach it without some knowledge of the subject. Acquaintance with all that has been said on the various topics is assumed. The author's task is simply to say the last word. Of the numberless allusions to the work of other scholars, very many are so concealed that they would not be recognized if the reader were not already familiar with them, some offer a slight clue to the source, and only a few supply a reference sufficiently exact for the purposes of consultation. A further difficulty is that the book does not, like Nilsson's "History of Greek Religion", present the well-considered conclusions of the author, with the essential concrete illustrations; it is a vast assemblage of special studies from which the reader is often left to draw for himself the appropriate conclusions. The author seldom permits himself to write continuous and lucid exposition. For this reason again, the book will be somewhat difficult to use without the index which is to be provided in the second volume. This is important because one will wish to consult the *λόγια* of Wilamowitz on a thousand subjects. It is indeed, to a large degree, a collection of *λόγια* with which we have to do, and to each oracle might be appended the proud words: "So sprach Wilamowitz."

IVAN M. LINFORTH.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

FR. HEICHELHEIM. *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus.* Jena, Fischer, 1930. 142 pp.

Heichelheim has here attempted for the first time to work out a graph to show the fluctuation of prices in the Eastern Mediterranean from 300 B. C. to the time of Augustus. His four very interesting chapters deal with the history of money for the period, the changes of prices in natural products, similar changes in rents and prices of real estate, and a discussion of freight

charges, wages, costs of living, and interest rates. Then he gives the tables of known prices on which his discussion is based and finally an economic chart displaying the fluctuations.

Much of the material is taken, of course, from the researches of Wilcken, Grenfell and Hunt, Glotz, Jardé, Ziebarth, Gerth, Segré, and others, but he has a complete command of his sources and often uses unpublished material. The chief value of the work lies in its brilliant interpretation of data already collected and the combination of observations into a unified picture. In general he seems to have proved that high prices, which followed Alexander's conquests, held fairly well till about 300-280 B. C., then fell gradually till about 250. There followed a slight rise with a perceptible fall about 225, then a noticeable rise about the end of the century. Through the middle of the second century prices are low, probably because of sluggish economic activity. The century ends (a period of piracy) in a rise of prices. Very interesting are his attempts to show how the silver coinage of the states of the Aegean suffered in consequence of Rome's intervention in the East after 200, and his very reasonable discussion of ratios between silver and bronze in Egypt. Numismatists working in museums have seldom dared to consider the economic implications of their datings. Heichelheim sees coins not as museum pieces but as media of exchange.

Needless to say he does not claim to give a final conclusion. By accident the price lists of Delos happen to be made up of articles that concerned temples. We can hardly match the U. S. Labor Department statistics with lists made from the prices of wheat, oil, pigs, geese, wood, pitch, and a few other minor articles. Furthermore, the measures, like the *keramion*, are somewhat fickle and the wages given are not always for full days. At times the author has apparently been tempted to simplify his problem. He has rightly seen the effects of Ptolemaic military defeats on the coinage in Egypt, but in comparing prices of articles like wheat, barley, and wine with those of the Aegean and of Italy, the effects of monopolistic control and of the nature of Egyptian production deserved a fuller consideration. Then, too, the fall of prices after 300 is explained too simply by reference to increased production. To be sure the Alexandrian booty was being absorbed in production to some extent, but the metals were also being diverted into articles of luxury, monopolies were growing, and the periods of alternate war and peace affected the markets seriously. Not enough attention is paid to historical events.

Finally, he is rather reckless about his Italian prices. Rostovtzeff (*Art. Frumentum*, P. W., 147) long ago insisted that the prices quoted for the Po-valley were abnormally low. In fact, Polybius says they were. To take these as normal prices for Italy is to disregard the text and the fact that freight charges

were very high. It can be demonstrated that the normal price of wheat at Rome in Cato's day did not range far from three denarii for four modii—which is more than three times the price that Heichelheim assumes in order to establish a working relation of prices between Italy and the East. In fact, freight charges were too high to allow of trans-shipment of bulky articles of moderate prices between Rome and the East except at times of famine.

Nevertheless Heichelheim's book is a good, if daring, beginning. When we get fuller price lists, the work will be carried on along the lines he has indicated and supplemented with a fuller knowledge of historical events.

TENNEY FRANK.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

A Concordance of Prudentius. ROY JOSEPH DEFERRARI and JAMES MARSHALL CAMPBELL. The Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge, Mass., 1932. x + 833 pp. \$12.30.

The Mediaeval Academy of America deserves the special thanks of all Latinists for this important addition to their scholarly apparatus. The Concordance is based on the text of Prudentius published by J. Bergman, Vienna, 1926 (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vol. LXI), all variant readings and conjectures being ignored. The volume is well planned: homonyms are carefully separated, and an adequate amount of context is given under each heading. After a reasonable number of tests, one feels that the compilers have attained a high degree of accuracy. The typography is excellent.

W. P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Ovid's Fasti, with an English Translation by Sir JAMES GEORGE FRAZER. London, William Heinemann Ltd.; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931. xxxii + 461 pp. \$2.50.

One of the latest and most interesting volumes of the Loeb Classical Library. The text and translation are reproduced from the translator's large edition of the Fasti, in five volumes, London, 1929. The notes have been specially written for this edition by Dr. W. H. D. ROUSE, one of the general editors of the Library. Dr. ROUSE has also added an Appendix, of 58 pp., selected and abridged from the rich store of commentary in the editio maior. This treats of such topics as, Lupercalia, Regifugium, Mars,

Nemi, The Parilia, Semo Sancus, etc. The book is well planned, and very carefully printed—a model of accuracy for future contributors to the series.

W. P. M.

Francesco Petrarca: Luoghi dell' "Africa." Traduzione e Note per cura di ENRICO CARRARA. Milano, Carlo Signorelli, 1930. 143 pp. 6 Lire.

Students of Renaissance Latin will be interested in these selections from Petrarch's Latin poem *Africa*. Professor CARRARA gives 30 illustrative passages, a total of 2100 lines. His text is taken in the main from the National Edition of the *Africa* published by Nicola Festa, Florence, 1928. It is accompanied by a version in Italian prose, with an introductory note to each selection, and some brief comments. Perhaps a few more parallels might have been cited from Statius and Claudian (A.J.P. XLII 108-121). P. 81, l. 683, *gladio* should be *gladios*.

W. P. M.

Les Satires de Juvénal: Étude et Analyse par PIERRE DE LABRIOLLE. Mellottée, Paris, 1931. 367 pp. 20 fr.

Here is an excellent study of Juvenal, written for the general reader by a professor at the Sorbonne. It gives the contents of each Satire, partly by direct translation, with some discussion of the subject and its treatment. Something is said occasionally of the more important imitations and adaptations of Juvenal by later writers, especially in France. One further instance which might have been mentioned is the free use Aeneas Silvius made of the Fifth Satire in his *De Curialium Miseriis*.

W. P. M.

Aristotle's Psychology of Conduct. By A. K. GRIFFIN. Williams Norgate Ltd., London 1931. 186 pp.

This book purports to be "a general consecutive account of the psychology of conduct" as it exists in scattered passages of Aristotle's works. The author has collected these passages and put them into the order they would presumably have had in a special Aristotelian treatise on this subject. After a brief exposition of Aristotle's statements concerning the parts and functions of the soul and a more extensive description of the contents of the desiderative part of the soul, there follow in three chapters lists of the instincts and emotions, the habits which, developing

from the various desires, proceed to create character, and the characteristics, that is the virtues and vices, which are the results of the process. A short chapter concerned with the changes in character due to the growth of the individual and the change of external circumstances concludes the book.

The work is strictly what the author promises, a collection of passages from Aristotle's writings; except for the collection and arrangement of these excerpts very little has been added to Aristotle's own words. For the most part the passages quoted are given in the versions of the Oxford Translations; but now and then for quotations of a few words the author gives his own translation. In one case (p. 63), the sentence "Physical love is ideally a sort of excess of affection, and that is only possible towards one person" is a mistranslation which weakens the position of Aristotle. The Greek means: "It (passionate love) tends to be an excess of affection, and that towards one person." There is, apart from a few typographical errors in the references, a misuse of *De Sensu* 436A9. In that passage anger and appetite are not called desires but are listed with sensation, memory, and desire generally as characteristic marks of animals. Sometimes the abruptness of the quotation comes very near to resulting in a false statement. On page 24 after speaking of desire, pleasure, and pain, the author quotes *De Anima* 413B21: "Each of the parts has sensation and movement from place to place . . ."; in its context the word "parts" refers to parts of insects, not to divisions of the soul. On page 71 it is said that "longing" is "the last stage of love" although the passage cited as authority for the statement reads: "And this is the beginning of love for everyone."

Professor Griffin's own remarks are chiefly brief recapitulations of the passages he quotes; but now and then he mentions the relation of Aristotle's doctrine to that of Plato. On page 34 he says that the definition of pleasure which Aristotle refutes ("Every pleasure is the conscious generation of a natural state") is Platonic. This certainly is not true; that Speusippos used it is merely Fritzsche's guess, and Stewart's suggestion that it belongs rather to Aristippus is much more plausible.

In the preface it is made "one of Aristotle's glories that he has cut ethics and politics loose from metaphysics"; but the importance of the "intuitive reason" in Aristotle's system makes it plain that he did not succeed in this operation. Professor Griffin practically admits this on page 127. He should not have allowed the contradiction to stand. And admirers of Aristotle may console themselves for his failure by remembering that no one has ever devised an ethics capable of existing without a foundation in *objective* truth.

This book as a collection of the Aristotelian passages pertinent to the psychology of conduct should fulfil the author's hope in

offering students an easy approach to the *Ethics* and the *Politics*. It would have proved much more convenient, however, had it been equipped with an index. *

HAROLD CHERNISS.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

EDWARD KENNARD RAND. A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible. Reprinted from *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XXIV, No. 4, October, 1931, pp. 323-396. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

The science of Latin paleography began under Mabillon with a controversy over the date and authenticity of certain documents. At this moment our knowledge of one of its most interesting departments, the history of the School of Tours under Alcuin and his successors, is being powerfully furthered by a friendly debate between Rand and Köhler. Rand, in his "Survey of the MSS of Tours" (1929; 200 plates) approached the subject as a paleographer; Köhler, in "Die Schule von Tours," Vol. I of his "Karolingische Miniaturen" (1930; 124 plates), as an art critic. In this brochure, Rand notes that Köhler sanctions his attribution of 232 MSS to Tours in all but 28 cases; he proceeds to discuss their more important divergences with signal acuteness and learning. As his previous study of the Morgan Pliny MS furnished the student of text criticism with an admirable introduction, the Rand-Köhler Tours discussion (continued in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 193 (1931), 321-359) provides the young paleographer with the best of material. Especially interesting is Rand's treatment of the Morgan Gospels and the Bamberg Bible, to which he would assign an early date; the Ashburnham Pentateuch, which he thinks may have had great influence on the Tours School; and his demonstration of the importance of the Bible text and the Capitula as dating criteria. Altogether this is a piece of criticism of which our lamented master Traube, whom Rand invokes at the beginning, would have been deservedly proud.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

C. Sallusti Crispi Epistulae ad Caesarem Senem de Re Publica iterum edidit ALPHONSUS KURFESS. Teubner, Leipzig, 1930. Pp. vi + 29.

There are few changes in the new edition of the Sallustian *suasoriae*. More than a score of items have been added to the

bibliography in the last ten years, and recent opinion is almost unanimous that the works are genuine. Only in the case of the second suasoria are there difficulties, but, as Seel (Otto Seel, *Sallust von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur Coniuratio Catilinae*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1930) points out, many of these vanish as soon as we fix the date near the close of the year 50 B. C., before, not after, the beginning of the civil war. This view I share, having adopted it, like Seel, independently of Gelzer, whose argument is quoted by Seel and who anticipated us both (for my article see *The Classical Weekly*, XXI, 19-23). My statement of the case is somewhat fuller than his. The setting for the epistle is provided by Dio Cassius XL, 63-66. Pompey has intervened by force of arms; Caesar has not yet done so. In fact the writer's chief concern is to convince Caesar that in his own interest and in that of his country he must intervene.

The greatest difficulty that remains, that of the forty senators and many promising youths besides who were offered as victims to Cato (II, 4, 2), Domitius, and the rest of their faction, is not insuperable. I formerly suggested that this might be a reference to the activity of Cicero during and after the Catilinarian conspiracy; indeed the reference to Sulla here might well be prompted by the same considerations that led to the comparison of Cicero with Sulla in the *Invective against Cicero* (3, 6) that is attributed to Sallust. One would expect, however, a reference to something more recent, such as the degradation of senators and knights in 50 B. C. by the censor Appius; and Sallust's language can be interpreted to fit Dio's account quite closely if we adopt, as I believe we should, the suggestion of Harriet Dale Johnson (*Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. LXI, page XXXIX) that *mactati* need not mean 'slain' in the literal sense. Furthermore, we should read in the text *Catoni* and interpret the dative not as a Greek dative of agent, but like the dative with *θω*. Compare Tacitus *Annals*, II, 13: *perfidus et ruptores pacis ultioni et gloriae mactandos* (this was pointed out by Otto Gebhardt in *Philologische Wochenschrift*, LI (1931), 1038). The senators were sacrificed to the interests of Cato's party when they were expelled from the senate. Since Sallust was included by the censor amongst those expelled in spite of his noble birth, he might be pardoned a rather rhetorical reference to the event. Rhetoric and a bold use of language are decidedly characteristic of his style.

There is one defect that vitiates much of the discussion of these works, a failure to take into consideration the Greek sources of Sallust. Kurfess, though he lists my article in his bibliography, still prints the emendation *coaequatur* at II, 8, 2. So does Rolfe in the revised Loeb. Since objections to the genuineness of the epistle have been based on this passage, and since the note of Edmar (Birger Edmar, *Studien zu den Epistulae ad*

Caesarem Senem de Re Publica, Ohlsson, Lund 1931) does nothing to clear it up, I may perhaps be pardoned for pointing out once more that Sallust is adapting Plato *Menexenus* 238 D. The passage in Sallust, properly punctuated, is: ita coaequantur dignitate pecunia; virtute anteire alius alium properabit. Compare Plato: τὰς δὲ ἀρχὰς δίδωσι καὶ κράτος τοῖς αἰὲν δόξασιν ἀρίστοις εἶναι, καὶ οὔτε ἀσθενείᾳ οὔτε πένιᾳ οὔτ' ἀγνωσίᾳ πατέρων ἀπελήλαται οὐδεὶς. The idea is that if inequalities based on birth and property are removed, then the road will be open to real worth. If the Latin must be emended, the simplest change would be to insert 'et' after dignitate, where it might easily have fallen out. The force of dignitate is apparent if we note the contrast with pecunia in II, 7, 11 above: iudices a paucis probari regnum est, ex pecunia legi inhonestum. Sallust does not want wealth to be equalized with rank or worth; he wants neither to count for anything in elections. The use of Greek sources in the suasoriae is the strongest evidence for their genuineness. Since studies of clausulae, vocabulary, and grammar tend more and more to confirm Sallustian authorship, the question may be regarded as settled. The edition of Edmar provides abundant evidence on all points where Greek is not involved. Unfortunately neither Kurfess nor any other commentator supplies the lack of references to Greek parallels; and my own modest effort to do so remains a solitary and unregarded guidepost.

It is sad to contemplate the wasted effort of those who take Sallust seriously as a statesman. His programs are as rhetorical and as flimsy as any modern political platform. They are full of catchwords, traditional party cries, and noble sentiments; but they do not reveal either Sallust's purpose or Caesar's. To be sure Sallust definitely went over to Caesar when he was expelled from the senate, and we have presumably in the second suasoria his public announcement of the fact. He appeals to Caesar to save Rome for democracy, an appeal that Caesar found very useful; it enabled him to pose as a liberator. Compare his words (*Civil War*, I, 22, 5): se non maleficii causa ex provincia egressum sed uti populum Romanum factione paucorum oppressum in libertatem vindicaret. But neither Sallust nor Caesar was prepared to sacrifice personal advantage to principles. Political programs, when the election or the war is won, are easily forgotten. Sallust's epistles were thoroughly ephemeral; that is what makes them interesting as sidelights on history.

L. A. Post.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
HAVERFORD, PA.

A. Von Gerkan. Lauf der Römischen Stadtmauer vom Kapitol zum Aventin. Röm. Mitt., 1931, pp. 155-188.

Von Gerkan attempts to show that the Servian wall did not reach the Tiber, but ran from the Capitoline to the Palatine and thence to the Aventine. The essay is very important, continuing the work of Bunsen, Piganiol, and Saeftlund, and criticizing the views of Huelsen and Lanciani. I have space here for a few brief expressions of doubt. Von Gerkan thinks the Forum Boarium was merely a marsh till about 200 B. C. Yet in 213 B. C. it was so built over that a fire spread all the way from the Salinae to the Capitol. There is no reason to think that the Tiber overflowed its banks till its upper course was deforested, and the Ciminian forest still existed in the third century.

He also thinks that there was no room for an Emporium south of the Porta Trigemina, if we place the gate where Huelsen did; but if he will examine the Tiber bank at low water a few meters north of the new Victor Emanuel bridge, he will find remnants of a Faliscan-lava pavement of the kind that was used in 174 B. C. (*Roman Buildings*, 54).

The temple of Mater Matuta, which we know was in the Forum Boarium, he places near the Roman Forum inside of the wall that he relocates near the Aequimelium. Is it possible to suppose that the Forum Boarium lay on both sides of the wall?

He does not interpret Livy 24, 47, 15 naturally, where the contrast of *et extra* to the preceding phrases implies that the Forum Boarium was inside the wall, and he has some difficulty in explaining Livy (2, 10) and Dionysius (5, 23), who say explicitly that there was no wall on the side of the city that touched the river.

He doubts a sixth century wall at Rome, but why should he in view of Signia's early fortification?

Finally, if Rome's harbor was exposed when Hannibal marched on Rome, why did he not march in below the Capitoline, seize the Forum Boarium, and try to starve the city into submission, and why did not the Marian party do so in 87? Marius had to build pontoons above and below the city in order to control the harbor.

Von Gerkan's article touches the interpretation of many passages in the Latin authors and it will awaken much debate. We are grateful for a thorough discussion, and excavations may prove that he is correct. But I am not yet convinced.

TENNEY FRANK.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Bates (William Nickerson). *Quintus of Smyrna and the Siege of Troy*. (Reprinted from *Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe*, 1931, *University of Pennsylvania Press*, pp. 1-18.)

Bruns (Friedrich). *Goethe's Poems and Aphorisms*. Edited for the Goethe Society of America. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1932. Pp. xviii + 211. 8°. Probable price \$1.25. (Oxford Library of German Texts.)

Bulletin (The) of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. VI, Part I. November, 1931. Cardiff, *University of Wales Press Board*; *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*. Pp. 1-100. 8°.

Burn (Andrew Robert). *The Romans in Britain*. Oxford, *Basil Blackwell*, 1932. Pp. 228. 8°. 6s.

Busse (Adolf). *Selections from Goethe's Prose*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1932. Pp. viii + 226. 8°. Probable price \$1.25. (Oxford Library of German Texts.)

Christmas Carols Printed in the Sixteenth Century including Kele's Christmas carolles newly Inprynted. Reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Huntingdon Library. Edited by Edward Bliss Reed. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1932. Pp. lxxix + 104. \$4.00. (Huntingdon Library Publications.)

Cornelius (Friedrich). *Cannae. Das militärische und das literarische Problem*. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1932. Pp. iv + 86. 8°. M. 5. (= *Klio*, Beiheft XXVI.)

Dahlmann (Hellfried). *Varro und die hellenistische Sprachtheorie*. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1932. Pp. 89. 8°. RM. 6. (Problemata. Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie. Heft 5.)

Deferrari (Roy J.) and James M. Campbell. *A Concordance of Prudentius*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, *The Mediaeval Academy of America*, 1932. Pp. ix + 833. 8°. \$12.50. (The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication No. 9.)

Frank (Tenney). *Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1932. Pp. xi + 155. 8°. (Martin Classical Lectures. II.) \$2.00.

Frank (Tenney). *Storia di Roma*. Translated by M. Fazio, with a bibliographical appendix by G. Sanna. 2 vols. Firenze, *La Nuova Italia*, 1932. Pp. 412 + 567. 8°. L. 24. (Biblioteca di Cultura. 2.)

Greek-English (A) Lexicon. Compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. A New Edition. Revised and augmented throughout by H. S. Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Part 6: λ—ol. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1932. 4°.

Hasluck (Margaret M.) *Albanian-English Reader*. Sixteen Albanian Folk-Stories Collected and Translated, with Two Grammars and Vocabularies. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1932. Pp. xl + 145. 8°. \$1.75.

Herzog-Hauser (Gertrud). *Soter. Die Vorstellung des Retters im altgriechischen Epos*. Wien, *Verlag Mayer & Comp.*, 1931. Pp. viii + 190. 8°. R. M. 8.

Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume I. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1932. Pp. 218.

Hjelmlev (Louis). Etudes Baltiques. Copenhagen, *Levin & Munksgaard*, 1932. Pp. xi + 272. 4°.

Jackson (A. V. Williams). Researches in Manichaeism. With special reference to the Turfan fragments. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1932. Pp. xxxviii + 393. 8°. \$5.00.

Journal (The) of Education. Vol. 63, Nos. 739, 748, 749; Vol. 64, Nos. 751, 752, 753. London, *William Rice*.

Junghanns (Paul). Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1932. Pp. 184. 8°. M. 11.50. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIV, Heft I.)

Key to and Primer of Interlingua or Latin without inflections meant to be used as an international auxiliary language amongst peoples of various mother tongues. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*; New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1931. Pp. v + 168. 8°. \$1.25.

Lutz (Henry F.) Real Estate Transactions from Kish. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1932. 8°. \$.85. (University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 187-216.)

Macurdy (Grace Harriet). Hellenistic Queens. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*; *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1932. Pp. xv + 250. 8°. \$4.00. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology. No. 14.)

Manfren-Bartolani (Giacomina). La Disfatta di C. Centenio (217 a. C.) nel racconto di Livio (XXII, 8, 1). Pinerolo, *Tip. Già Chiantore-Mascarelli*, 1932. Pp. 8.

Miklós (Pálffy). A magyar és a jelentősebb külföldi műszaki szótárak bibliográfiája. (Reprint from Technika, XI, Budapest, 1931.)

Norsk Riksmålsordbok. Hefte 6. Oslo, *H. Aschehoug & Co.'s Forlag*, 1932. Pp. 702-828. Kr. 1.00.

Nutting (H. C.) On the Adnominal Genitive in Latin. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1932. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 10, No. 10, pp. 245-308.)

Peeters (Félix). Les Universités américaines et la Philologie classique. Extrait du Tome III, no. 4, avril 1932, du *Bulletin des Alumni*. Pp. 1-12.

Philological Quarterly. Volume XI. Number 2. April, 1932. Iowa City, *University of Iowa*. Pp. 97-224. 8°.

Platonic (The) Epistles. Translated with Introduction and Notes by J. Harward. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1932. Pp. xii + 244. 8°. \$5.00.

Rapini (Renati) Hortorum Libri IV. With an English translation by James Gardiner. Edited by Irving T. McDonald. Worcester, Mass., *The Holy Cross Press*, 1932. 16°. (Library Series No. 1.) \$2.15.

Säflund (Gösta). Le Mura di Roma Repubblicana. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1932. Pp. xvi + 278. Plates 27. 4°. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. I. Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sveciae. I.)

Saleski (R. E.). *The Principle of Form in Historical and Psychological Linguistics*. (Reprint from the West Virginia Academy of Science bulletin, pp. 237-249.)

Sewanee Review. April-June, 1932. Sewanee, Tennessee, *The University of the South*. Pp. 256. 8°.

Stoici antichi. I frammenti ordinati tradotti e annotati da Nicola Festa. Vol. I. Zenone. Bari, *Gius. Laterza e Figli*, 1931. Pp. viii + 129. 8°. L. 15,00.

Throm (Hermann). *Die Thesis. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte*. Paderborn, *Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh*, 1932. Pp. 198. 8°. (Rhetorische Studien. 17. Heft.)

Todd Memorial Volumes. 2 volumes. Edited by John D. Fitz-Gerald and Pauline Taylor. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1930. Pp. xiv + 226, viii + 264. 8°.

Vercelli (The) Book. Edited by George Philip Krapp. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1932. Pp. xcvi + 152. 8°. \$3.50. (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records. II.)

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich von). *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. Band II. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1932. Pp. xii + 620. 8°. RM. 36.

o-
of

i-

la
+

g
p.

ld
p.

k,
ie

n.
0.